Final Mercury Management

Environmental Impact Statement

Volume II

March 2004

Defense Logistics Agency
Defense National Stockpile Center
Fort Belvoir, VA

FINAL MERCURY MANAGEMENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Lead Agency: Defense Logistics Agency,
Defense National Stockpile Center

Cooperating Organizations

U.S. Department of Energy

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics
Office of Federal Activities

Consulting Organizations

U.S. Department of Commerce

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

U.S. Geological Survey

PREPARER:

12/9/03

F. Kevin Reilly Date
Director, Environmental Management
and Quality Assurance
Defense National Stockpile Center

PROPONENT:

12/9/03

Cornel A. Holder Date
Administrator
Defense National Stockpile Center

APPROVED BY:

1/30/04

Jan B. Reitman Date
Staff Director, Office of Environment and Safety
Defense Logistics Agency

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

COVER SHEET

LEAD AGENCY: Defense Logistics Agency, Defense National Stockpile Center

COOPERATING AGENCIES: U.S. Department of Energy, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

TITLE OF THE PROPOSED ACTION: To select and implement an approach for the long-term (i.e., 40 years) management of the defense stockpile of elemental mercury, which is no longer needed for national defense.

POINT OF CONTACT: Information concerning the environmental impact statement can be obtained at the project Web site (www.mercuryeis.com), by calling 1-888-306-6682, or by writing to the Project Manager, ATTN: Project Manager, Mercury Management EIS, DNSC-E, Defense National Stockpile Center, 8725 John F. Kingman Road, Suite 3229, Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223.

APPROVAL AUTHORITY: Defense Logistics Agency, Staff Director, Office of Environment and Safety

DOCUMENT DESIGNATION: Final Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

AFFECTED JURISDICTIONS: Hawthorne, NV; New Haven, IN; Oak Ridge, TN; Romulus, NY; Somerville, NJ; Tooele, UT; and Warren, OH

ABSTRACT: The Defense National Stockpile Center is responsible for the disposition of stockpiled items declared excess to national defense needs. The United States Congress has determined that the U.S. Department of Defense no longer needs to maintain a stockpile of mercury due to the increased use of mercury substitutes and due to increases in the nation's secondary production (i.e., recovery/recycling). This excess commodity grade mercury was offered for sale in open competitions until 1994 when concerns over mercury accumulation in the global environment prompted the Defense National Stockpile Center to suspend sales. The Defense National Stockpile Center inventory of mercury (approximately 4,890 tons; 4,436 metric tons) is currently stored in enclosed warehouses at four sites in the United States. As custodian of the mercury, the Defense National Stockpile Center must decide on a strategy for long-term management of this material. In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Defense Logistics Agency Regulation 1000.22, Environmental Considerations in Defense Logistics Agency Actions in the United States, the Defense National Stockpile Center has prepared the Final EIS to evaluate the environmental impacts of a range of reasonable alternatives for long-term management (i.e., 40 years) of the excess mercury. The alternatives are: (1) no action, i.e., maintaining storage at the four existing sites; (2) consolidation and storage at one of the current DNSC mercury storage sites or at one of three other candidate locations; and (3) sale of the mercury inventory. The agency's preferred alternative is consolidated storage. The Final EIS describes the potential environmental, human health, and socioeconomic impacts of these alternatives, together with cost considerations. Several treatment technologies were considered as possible alternatives for mercury management. Based on the immaturity of bulk mercury treatment technologies and the lack of an EPA-approved path forward for treatment and disposal of elemental mercury, this alternative is not considered viable and is not evaluated in detail in the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: In preparing the Final EIS, the Defense National Stockpile Center considered comments received during the scoping period (February 5, 2001, to June 30, 2001) and during the comment period on the Draft EIS (April 11, 2003, to July 18, 2003). Comments received on the Draft EIS after the close of the comment period were also considered.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms vi
Units of Measure vi
Metric Conversion Chart and Metric Prefixes vii

Chapter 1 Introduction
1.1 Background 1–1
1.2 The Public Comment Process 1–1
1.3 Public Meetings 1–2
1.4 Comments on the Draft MM EIS 1–2
1.5 Environmental Protection Agency Rating 1–4
1.6 Issues Raised During the Public Comment Period 1–4
1.6.1 Consolidated Storage and No Action Alternatives 1–5
1.6.2 Sales Alternative 1–5
1.6.3 Storage Building Design and Operation 1–6
1.6.4 Health and Safety 1–7
1.6.5 Accidents and Natural Disasters 1–7
1.6.6 Transportation 1–7
1.6.7 Terrorist Attack 1–8
1.6.8 Environment 1–8
1.6.9 Socioeconomics 1–8
1.6.10 Cost 1–9
1.6.11 Stewardship 1–9
1.6.12 MM EIS Schedule 1–9
1.6.13 Public Outreach 1–10
1.6.14 Other Site Issues 1–10
1.7 Changes to the Final MM EIS 1–10
1.8 References 1–10

Chapter 2 Comment Documents and Responses
2.1 Organization 2–1
2.2 Comment Documents 2–22
2.3 Responses 2–315
2.4 References 2–349

List of Tables

Table 1–1. Meeting Schedule and Estimated Attendance 1–2
Table 1–2. Comment Documents by Submission Method 1–3
Table 1–3. Comments by Issue Category 1–3

Table 2–1. Index of Commentors 2–2
Table 2–2. Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign or Petition 2–10
Table 2–3. Index of Responses by Issue Category 2–315

List of Acronyms

CFR	*Code of Federal Regulations*
DLA	Defense Logistics Agency
DLAR	Defense Logistics Agency Regulations
DNSC	Defense National Stockpile Center
DoD	U.S. Department of Defense
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
DOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
EIS	environmental impact statement
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ERPG	Emergency Response Planning Guideline
FR	*Federal Register*
LO	Lack of Objections
MM EIS	*Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement*
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
RfC	reference concentration
RfD	reference dose
ROD	Record of Decision
U.S.C.	United States Code
Y–12	U.S. Department of Energy's Y–12 National Security Complex

Units of Measure

°C	degrees Celsius (Centigrade)
°F	degrees Fahrenheit
ft	feet
gal	gallon
kg	kilogram
km	kilometer
hr	hour
l	liter
lb	pound
m	meter
mi	mile
mph	miles per hour
yr	year (in compound units)

Metric Conversion Chart

To Convert Into Metric			To Convert Out of Metric		
If You Know	**Multiply By**	**To Get**	**If You Know**	**Multiply By**	**To Get**
Length					
inches	2.54	centimeters	centimeters	0.3937	inches
feet	30.48	centimeters	centimeters	0.0328	feet
feet	0.3048	meters	meters	3.281	feet
yards	0.9144	meters	meters	1.0936	yards
miles	1.60934	kilometers	kilometers	0.6214	miles
Area					
sq. inches	6.4516	sq. centimeters	sq. centimeters	0.155	sq. inches
sq. feet	0.092903	sq. meters	sq. meters	10.7639	sq. feet
sq. yards	0.8361	sq. meters	sq. meters	1.196	sq. yards
acres	0.40469	hectares	hectares	2.471	acres
sq. miles	2.58999	sq. kilometers	sq. kilometers	0.3861	sq. miles
Volume					
fluid ounces	29.574	milliliters	milliliters	0.0338	fluid ounces
gallons	3.7854	liters	liters	0.26417	gallons
cubic feet	0.028317	cubic meters	cubic meters	35.315	cubic feet
cubic yards	0.76455	cubic meters	cubic meters	1.308	cubic yards
Weight					
ounces	28.3495	grams	grams	0.03527	ounces
pounds	0.45360	kilograms	kilograms	2.2046	pounds
short tons	0.90718	metric tons	metric tons	1.1023	short tons
Temperature					
Fahrenheit	Subtract 32 then multiply by 5/9ths	Celsius	Celsius	Multiply by 9/5ths, then add 32	Fahrenheit

Metric Prefixes

Prefix	Symbol	Multiplication Factor
exa-	E	1 000 000 000 000 000 000 = 10^{18}
peta-	P	1 000 000 000 000 000 = 10^{15}
tera-	T	1 000 000 000 000 = 10^{12}
giga-	G	1 000 000 000 = 10^{9}
mega-	M	1 000 000 = 10^{6}
kilo-	k	1 000 = 10^{3}
hecto-	h	100 = 10^{2}
deka-	da	10 = 10^{1}
deci-	d	0.1 = 10^{-1}
centi-	c	0.01 = 10^{-2}
milli-	m	0.001 = 10^{-3}
micro-	µ	0.000 001 = 10^{-6}
nano-	n	0.000 000 001 = 10^{-9}
pico-	p	0.000 000 000 001= 10^{-12}
femto-	f	0.000 000 000 000 001 = 10^{-15}
atto-	a	0.000 000 000 000 000 001= 10^{-18}

Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 BACKGROUND

In April 2003, the Defense National Stockpile Center (DNSC) published the *Draft Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement* (MM EIS) (DLA 2003). In accordance with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and the related Council on Environmental Quality and Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) implementation regulations (40 CFR 1500 through 1508 and DLAR 1000.22, respectively), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and DLA announced the availability of the Draft MM EIS in *Federal Register* (FR) notices (68 FR 17801 [EPA 2003] and 68 FR 17786 [DLA 2003]) and invited interested parties to provide comments.

Prior to publication of the Draft MM EIS, members of the Interagency Working Group reviewed the document and provided comments to DNSC. The Interagency Working Group is composed of members representing the U. S. Department of Energy (DOE), Department of Commerce, EPA, U.S. Geological Survey, and Department of Health and Human Services. In addition, under their roles as cooperating agencies, DOE and EPA concurred on the MM EIS for publication.

1.2 THE PUBLIC COMMENT PROCESS

The Draft MM EIS or the *Executive Summary* was distributed to more than 830 individuals and organizations, including appropriate state clearinghouses and regulatory agencies. NEPA regulations mandate a minimum 45-day comment period after the publication of the EPA's Notice of Availability of a draft EIS to provide an opportunity for the public to comment. The comment period on the Draft MM EIS began on April 11, 2003, and provided the public with more than twice the required number of days to comment. Additionally, in response to public request to extend the comment period, the deadline for transmittal of comments was extended informally from July 18, 2003 (as stated in the *Federal Register*), to September 2, 2003. DNSC continued to address late comments to the extent practicable in preparing the Final MM EIS. All comments were considered, and the issues and concerns raised are reflected in this document.

Soon after the Notice of Availability was published in the *Federal Register*, display advertisements were prominently placed in local newspapers of potentially affected areas to communicate the availability of the Draft MM EIS to the public. Prior to each public meeting, except in Washington, D.C., display advertisements were placed in local newspapers. The advertisements, which were run on one weekday and one weekend day, provided specific information about the time, place, and format of the meetings; location of local information repositories; and various mechanisms for submitting comments. Postcards were also sent to households in the immediate vicinity of potentially affected sites announcing the same information.

Information about DNSC and copies of the Draft MM EIS, *Executive Summary*, and *Draft Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Report for the Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement* were available during and after the comment period at 15 information repositories (typically located in local libraries) and via the MM EIS Web site (www.mercuryeis.com). Additional information materials available for review included fact sheets and the MM EIS newsletter. The MM EIS Web site also contains a photo gallery and links to other mercury-related Web sites.

1.3 PUBLIC MEETINGS

During the comment period, DNSC held seven meetings to discuss the proposed action and receive oral and written comments on the Draft MM EIS. The meetings were held in the communities that could be affected by the proposed actions, as well as in Washington, D.C. The meeting schedule and estimated attendance at each meeting are presented in Table 1–1. The attendance is based on the number of registration forms completed and returned to DNSC at each meeting and may not reflect all those who attended.

Table 1–1. Meeting Schedule and Estimated Attendance

Meeting Location	Date	Attendance
New Haven, Indiana	May 20, 2003	140
Niles, Ohio	May 22, 2003	15
Hawthorne, Nevada	June 10, 2003	3
Tooele, Utah	June 12, 2003	9
Hillsborough, New Jersey	June 17, 2003	43
Washington, D.C.	June 24, 2003	6
Oak Ridge, Tennessee	July 1, 2003	14
Total		**230**

An independent facilitator was present at each meeting to direct and clarify discussions and comments. A court reporter also was present at each meeting to record the proceedings. Sign-language interpreters were available for the hearing impaired. Transcripts of the meetings are available at the 15 information repositories listed on the project Web site (www.mercuryeis.com) and identified in the *Federal Register* notice (68 FR 17786).

DNSC representatives were available to meet with the public for informal discussions before and after the meetings. The interactive format included an exhibit area, a DNSC presentation, a public comment session, and a question and answer session. Each meeting opened with a welcome from the facilitator, followed by a presentation on the proposed action by a DNSC representative. This was followed by a comment session, during which attendees were given an opportunity to provide comments. To ensure that all attendees were given an opportunity to speak, each person was limited to 5 minutes. Commentors who required additional time were invited to speak again after everyone had an initial opportunity to provide comments. Finally, the facilitator directed a question and answer session to give the audience a chance to ask about the material presented.

At the public meetings, several means were available for commenting on the Draft MM EIS. In addition to the public comment session, the court reporter remained available for those who wished to provide comments in a private setting. Comment forms were available so individuals could provide written comments. Five additional mechanisms were also available throughout the comment period to submit comments on the Draft MM EIS: email, toll-free fax and telephone, U.S. mail, and the MM EIS Web site.

1.4 COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT MM EIS

DNSC received 295 comment documents containing 633 comments addressing a wide range of issues. All comments submitted to DNSC during the comment period were given equal consideration in preparation of the Final MM EIS. Comments determined to be

A ***comment document*** is a comment or set of comments submitted by an individual or organization. Examples of comment documents include letters, emails, voice mail messages, faxes, and meeting transcripts.

beyond the scope of the MM EIS are not addressed in the final EIS. Table 1–2 lists the number of comment documents received by method of submission.

Table 1–2. Comment Documents by Submission Method

Method	Number of Comment Documents
Email	14
Fax	10
Public Meeting[a]	86
Telephone	85
U.S. Mail	55
Web Site	45
Total	**295**

[a] Includes commentors providing oral or written comments.

Upon receipt, all comment documents were assigned a sequential identification number used for tracking during the comment response process. Oral comments presented at the meetings were transcribed, identified by the commentor's name, and assigned an identification number. All comment documents were then processed through the comment response system for inclusion in this document. The comment documents were analyzed to discern specific comments, which were assigned to one of 30 issue categories to facilitate development of a response and provide an overview of the type of comments that DNSC received. The number of comments assigned to each issue category is shown in Table 1–3.

Table 1–3. Comments by Issue Category

Code	Issue Category	Number of Comments
AC	Alternative – Consolidated Storage	241
AE	Alternative – Eliminated	15
AG	Alternative – General	6
AN	Alternative – No Action	21
AP	Alternative – Preferred	10
AS	Alternative – Sales	18
CB	Cost/Benefit	13
CR	Cultural Resources	6
DM	Decisions to Be Made/Record of Decision	19
DD	Decontamination and Decommissioning	4
EC	Ecological Resources	8
EO	EIS Presentation and Organization	1
ER	Emergency Response	9
EP	Environmental Regulations, Permits, and Consultations	4
LU	Land Use and Visual Resources	3
NP	NEPA Process/Adequacy	7
OS	Other Site Issues	22
PO	Policy (DLA, DNSC, DOE, EPA)	8
PP	Public Participation	16
PN	Purpose, Need, and Timing	20
RP	Related Programs/Documents	1

Table 1–3. Comments by Issue Category (Continued)

Code	Issue Category	Number of Comments
RE	Risk – Ecological	3
RA	Risk – Human Health – Accidents	48
RN	Risk – Human Health – Normal Operations	14
RT	Risk – Transportation	17
SE	Socioeconomics	43
SB	Storage Building Design and Operation	33
WM	Waste Management	14
WR	Water Resources	9
Total		**633**

Key: DLA, Defense Logistics Agency; DNSC, Defense National Stockpile Center; DOE, U.S. Department of Energy; EIS, environmental impact statement; EPA, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; NEPA, National Environmental Policy Act.

Chapter 2 presents the comment documents, identifies the specific comment(s) from each, and provides DNSC's responses. Documents identical in content are presented only once. Campaigns and petitions likewise are presented once. One letter campaign (Comment Document No. 67) supporting the Consolidated Storage Alternative was submitted by 68 individuals or couples from around the United States. Three different petitions were submitted, one from Hillsborough, New Jersey (Comment Document No. 183), containing 1,040 signatures and two similar petitions (Comment Documents No. 184A and 184B) from New Haven, Indiana, that had a total of 677 signatures. Every effort was made to decipher signatures but those that were not readable are listed as "illegible."

1.5 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RATING

In accordance with EPA's responsibilities under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), NEPA, and the Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA, EPA reviewed the Draft MM EIS and assigned a Lack of Objections rating to the proposed action, EPA's highest rating. EPA did not identify any significant environmental concerns related to DNSC's preferred alternative. In EPA's opinion, the Draft MM EIS provided adequate documentation and suitable analysis upon which to base a decision. A copy of the EPA letter (Comment Document No. 27) is included in Section 2.2 of this volume.

1.6 ISSUES RAISED DURING THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

The majority of the comments are related to three issues:

- The Consolidated Storage Alternative
- Impacts on human health and safety of the mercury storage facility operations
- Environmental and economic impacts of mercury storage

The following is a summary of the major issues raised by the commentors and DNSC's responses. References made to document sections in DNSC's responses pertain to the Final MM EIS (Volume I) unless otherwise noted.

1.6.1 Consolidated Storage and No Action Alternatives

ISSUE SUMMARY: More comments were received on consolidated storage than on any other issue. Many commentors were opposed to the Consolidated Storage and No Action Alternatives. The most frequently cited reasons for opposition included concerns about:

- Human health risks from leaks, accidents, and terrorist acts
- Proximity of the storage locations to populated areas
- Adverse effects on property values and negative perceptions affecting economic growth in the surrounding communities
- Adverse effects on the environment

Some commentors suggested that DNSC obtain approval of state and local governments and the community before a site is selected for consolidated mercury storage.

> DNSC's top priorities are the health and safety of our workers and the community, and protection of the environment.

DNSC RESPONSE: As discussed in Section 2.3, DNSC's preferred alternative is consolidated storage at one location. However, no decisions will be made until after the EPA's Notice of Availability for the Final MM EIS is published in the *Federal Register*. Decisions on mercury management will be based on the environmental analyses presented in the EIS, including health and safety, security, and socioeconomics, and other factors such as cost, strategic considerations, and public input. DNSC will announce its decisions and the reasons for them in the Record of Decision (ROD), which will be published no earlier than 30 days after publication of the Final MM EIS Notice of Availability. The ROD may specify the Consolidated Storage Alternative (preferred alternative), No Action Alternative, Sales Alternative, or a combination of these alternatives.

As described in Section 1.5, DNSC has supported a vigorous public outreach program. DNSC has hosted 12 public meetings nationwide, and provided information on the MM EIS in the form of newsletters, fact sheets, reports, exhibits, and a Web site. Email and toll-free telephone and fax numbers have been available for public queries and comments. Postcards were sent to households in the immediate vicinity of potential storage sites to inform them of public meetings and comment opportunities. DNSC has also provided briefings for state and local officials and others in communities potentially affected by mercury management activities, and will continue to inform communities affected by the mercury management alternative that is selected.

1.6.2 Sales Alternative

ISSUE SUMMARY: A number of commentors expressed support for the Sales Alternative. Some suggested a hybrid alternative that would include consolidated storage and sale of all or a portion of the inventory from the consolidated storage location. A few commentors suggested that the sale of existing mercury stockpiles would be preferable to new mercury mining.

Others were concerned about or opposed to the sale of mercury. Some commentors said that any mercury sold on the open market would increase the amount of mercury in the global environment. Some expressed concern that sales of large quantities of mercury would depress mercury prices and result in the increased use of mercury. Other commentors questioned whether DNSC mercury is a marketable commodity or a hazardous waste.

DNSC RESPONSE: The sale of mercury is evaluated in the MM EIS. Two subalternatives are described in Section 2.2.3: (1) sales at the maximum allowable market rate (assumed to be 5,000 flasks per year), and (2) sales to reduce mercury mining. As described in Sections 4.4 and 4.5 and summarized in Section 2.5, there would be negligible-to-minor environmental and socioeconomic impacts from the Sales Alternative. Risks to the public from normal operations and facility accidents would be negligible to low. Section 1.3 notes that a hybrid alternative, combining the Consolidated Storage and Sales Alternatives, could be selected. The environmental impacts of hybrid alternatives would be bounded by impacts evaluated in the MM EIS.

As discussed in Section 2.2.3.2, the entire inventory of DNSC excess mercury could be sold to a mercury mining company with the agreement that mining would be reduced proportionately to compensate for the release of the DNSC mercury into the market. In the event the mercury is sold, it is expected that an agreement would be negotiated that would require the purchaser to sell DNSC mercury at a rate no greater than the rate of sale for newly mined mercury. Therefore, this alternative would meet the requirements of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of 1939, as amended (50 U.S.C. 98 et seq.) that sales would not result in undue disruption of the mercury market. European producers of chlorine and alkali are considering this approach (CEC 2002:9-12). As described in Section 4.5 and summarized in Section 2.5, the Sales to Reduce Mercury Mining Alternative could produce beneficial impacts by reducing impacts of mercury mining and refining.

As described in Sections 1.1 and 2.1, DNSC mercury is not a waste; it is a marketable commodity that is 99.5 percent to 99.9 percent pure. Mercury of this quality is currently bought and sold on the open market for uses such as thermometers, barometers, blood pressure monitors, switches, light bulbs, dental fillings, and medicines, among others. Mercury is designated a hazardous substance under Section 307(a) of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), Section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), and U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) hazardous materials regulations (49 CFR 172.101).

1.6.3 Storage Building Design and Operation

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors expressed concern that the storage buildings are not appropriate for mercury storage. Some questioned the mercury packaging and leak containment provisions, while others questioned whether the buildings are secure. However, some commentors said that they believe that the mercury is safely stored.

DNSC RESPONSE: As described in Section 2.2.1, mercury at the DNSC depots is stored in 76-lb (34-kg) capacity flasks sealed in airtight 30-gal (114-l) drums. The flasks are separated by dividers inside the drums and rest on an absorbent mat that doubles as cushioning material. Flasks are enclosed in plastic bags and sealed with wire ties. Drum lids have half-inch rubber gaskets, and a steel locking ring is bolted in place to seal the drum lid. The drums rest on catch trays on wooden pallets on sealed floors. As described in Section 4.2.1.5, the catch trays can contain the contents of several flasks. Floor curbing was recently installed in the mercury storage buildings at the New Haven, Somerville and Warren depots. Therefore, leakage of mercury in an amount sufficient to escape the warehouse is unlikely.

DNSC has safely stored mercury for over 50 years. As described in Section 2.2.4, periodic inspections would ensure that mercury storage containers are in good condition and leak free. Any defects in the packaging would be quickly corrected. Inspections would be conducted by appropriately trained DNSC or contract personnel.

Warehouses would be kept locked except for inspections and other periodic maintenance work. In addition to security, perimeter fencing, and closely controlled access comparable to the levels of protection at the current mercury storage sites, DNSC would work with local authorities to ensure that even the most unlikely scenarios would be handled properly.

1.6.4 Health and Safety

ISSUE SUMMARY: Many commentors expressed concerns about risks to public health and safety from storing the mercury, while others said that the mercury is safely stored.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC has safely stored mercury for more than 50 years. Because mercury is a hazardous material, DNSC imposes strict controls to prevent exposure or release to the environment or to personnel working in the storage locations.

The *Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Report for the Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement* (*Risk Assessment Report*) was performed to support the MM EIS (DLA 2004). The results of this risk assessment are included in the MM EIS. As described in Chapter 4 and summarized in Section 2.5 of the MM EIS, risks to the general public from normal operations would be negligible at any of the candidate sites for all the alternatives considered.

1.6.5 Accidents and Natural Disasters

ISSUE SUMMARY: Many commentors were concerned about the potential for adverse environmental and human health effects of accidents caused by natural disasters or human error. They referred to small spills and leaks of mercury and larger releases due to fire or natural disasters (e.g., tornados and earthquakes). Some were particularly concerned about the proximity of the storage facilities to populated areas. Some commentors were concerned that adequate emergency response capability is not available to respond to an accident involving mercury.

DNSC RESPONSE: As described in Chapter 4 and summarized in Section 2.5, risks to the public from mercury released during facility accidents would be negligible to low at any of the candidate sites for all the alternatives considered. Mercury vapors that might escape from the storage facility after an accident would be diluted to low concentrations before reaching the public. This includes mercury that could be released during natural disasters such as earthquakes and tornadoes and human-initiated spills, leaks, and other accidents.

Populations residing near the candidate sites are unlikely to face a major public health threat. This is because the risks are already negligible to low for an individual member of the public under the worst conditions that can reasonably be expected, and thus the risks for the general public would be even lower.

As described in the Chapter 4 water resources subsections, plans are in place should a leak or spill occur. The mercury storage sites have approved Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plans and Installation Spill Contingency Plans to ensure that the appropriate response to a spill is made. DNSC maintains equipment and trains the workforce at its mercury storage locations to respond to mercury spills. State and local emergency response teams are aware of the mercury storage. Should there be a mercury spill, an appropriate response would occur and the spill would be cleaned up to applicable standards.

1.6.6 Transportation

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors were concerned about the potential for adverse environmental and human health effects of transporting the mercury stockpile, including vehicle accidents.

DNSC RESPONSE: Mercury has been transported as a common industrial commodity for many years. If required, transportation of mercury would be in accordance with DOT hazardous material shipping requirements for using commercial truck and rail routes. The *Risk Assessment Report* (DLA 2004) evaluates the potential consequences of truck and rail transportation for both the Consolidated Storage

and Sales Alternatives. The results of the transportation risk assessment are presented in Chapter 4 and summarized in Section 2.5 of the MM EIS.

Risk is a function of both frequency and consequence, and the more miles traveled, the greater the opportunity for an accident to occur. Therefore, the greatest risk to the public would result from a truck transportation accident resulting in a mercury spill and fire under the Sales Alternative. This risk would be moderate if it were raining when the accident occurred. For the Consolidated Storage Alternative, risk from this accident would be low if the accident occurred while it was raining. The risk of a mechanically induced fatality occurring somewhere along the route would be moderate for the Sales Alternative and low for the Consolidated Storage Alternative.

Ecological risks resulting from this postulated accident range from negligible to high, depending on the receptor organism and the weather. High ecological risk would result under the Sales Alternative for certain ecological receptors, but only if it were raining at the time of the accident. Moderate ecological risk would result for certain ecological receptors under the Consolidated Sales Alternative. However, the probability that a fire would occur while it is raining and the limited area involved suggests that the ecological risks of transportation accidents are likely to be lower than estimated.

1.6.7 Terrorist Attack

ISSUE SUMMARY: Many commentors were concerned about the potential for adverse human health effects of sabotage of the mercury storage facilities. Some commentors referred to attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, as support for their concerns.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC provides armed security, perimeter fencing, and closely controlled access at the depots. DNSC also works with local authorities to ensure that even the most unlikely scenarios would be handled properly. DNSC has prepared a risk analysis of a deliberate aircraft crash and conducted vulnerability assessments to ensure that the mercury storage depots remain safe and secure. These internal reports, which indicate that the mercury stockpile is not a likely target for terrorists, are not available to the public for security reasons.

1.6.8 Environment

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors expressed concern about potential impacts of the stored mercury on the environment, particularly impacts on surface waters such as lakes and rivers and on groundwater, as well as impacts on fish and other wildlife.

DNSC RESPONSE: There would be no new construction and therefore no impacts on the environment from land-disturbing activities. As described in Chapter 4 and summarized in Section 2.5, negligible-to-minor environmental impacts would result from activities associated with the alternatives considered.

1.6.9 Socioeconomics

ISSUE SUMMARY: A number of commentors were concerned about impacts on property values due to a negative perception of mercury storage. Others were concerned about discouraging more desirable development in the region. Some commentors were concerned about their community being labeled a “dumping ground” for wastes and other hazardous materials.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC has worked with the public throughout the EIS process to help them understand the potential risks presented by the mercury management alternatives so that opinions can be

formulated based on facts and not perception. DNSC has safely stored mercury for more than 50 years and has taken additional precautions to ensure that it continues to be stored safely over the next 40 years by overpacking the mercury in steel drums and making modifications to the storage buildings. Sections 1.2.3 and 2.2.1 describe mercury storage at the existing locations. Potential human health risks from normal operations and facility accidents at each of the candidate sites are described in Sections 4.3.4 and 4.3.5 and summarized in Sections 2.5.1.4 and 2.5.1.5. The analyses indicate that there is negligible-to-low risk to the general public associated with consolidated mercury storage at any of the candidate sites.

1.6.10 Cost

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors questioned the validity of the mercury storage cost estimates and asked why the estimated costs differ greatly among the candidate sites.

DNSC RESPONSE: Cost estimates have been revised in the Final MM EIS. Facility cost estimates provided in the Draft MM EIS were based on actual square foot and other costs being paid by the Government at or near the properties being considered as possible consolidation sites. Commentors on the Draft EIS noted that these estimated costs, particularly for the Western sites, appeared higher than would be expected. DNSC analyzed the basis for these estimates and found that the costs included assumptions that were not consistent for all locations. For these reasons, DNSC decided to treat basic facility costs generically. Actual facility costs in the event that the long-term consolidated storage alternative is chosen would be established based on best value to the Government during a procurement process.

1.6.11 Stewardship

ISSUE SUMMARY: A few commentors asked who would provide regulatory oversight of a mercury storage facility.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC mercury will remain U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) property, and DoD will continue to fund and oversee the mercury storage operations. The storage facility would be required to comply with all applicable state and Federal laws and regulations.

1.6.12 MM EIS Schedule

ISSUE SUMMARY: A number of commentors questioned why DNSC is taking so long to complete the MM EIS and requested that the mercury be removed immediately from their communities. Other commentors asked when the EIS process would be complete and how long it would take to ship the mercury.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC is prohibited by NEPA from removing mercury from the existing storage locations until the EIS process has been completed. The Final MM EIS is currently scheduled for publication in early 2004. The ROD can be published no earlier than 30 days after the Final MM EIS is published. If the preferred alternative (consolidated storage) is selected, the ROD may or may not specify one of the candidate sites analyzed in the MM EIS. If one of the candidate sites is not specified, additional time would be needed to identify another storage location and, possibly, to prepare additional environmental review. Section 2.2.2 notes that DNSC anticipates it will require approximately one year to stage and move the mercury to a consolidated storage site.

1.6.13 Public Outreach

ISSUE SUMMARY: A few commentors asked for an extension of the public comment period.

DNSC RESPONSE: Because of requests for additional time to review and comment on the Draft MM EIS, DNSC informally extended the timeframe for submitting comments from July 18, 2003 (as stated in the *Federal Register* notice), to September 2, 2003.

1.6.14 Other Site Issues

ISSUE SUMMARY: A few commentors were concerned about existing contamination at the current DNSC mercury storage locations. Other commentors were concerned that mercury storage could slow cleanup activities at a given site.

DNSC RESPONSE: As described in Section 1.7.2, cleanup of existing environmental contamination at the DNSC depots is ongoing. DNSC uses the four-step approach required under the Defense Environmental Restoration Program in compliance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.). The goal is to identify and characterize contamination and restore depot property. The first two steps focus on identifying possible environmental problems. The three DNSC depots (New Haven, Somerville, and Warren) are currently at the third step, where the investigations are being expanded to define the nature and extent of suspected contamination. The fourth step involves actual cleanup (remediation). The environmental restoration process is progressing independent of the decision on mercury management.

1.7 CHANGES TO THE FINAL MM EIS

The Final MM EIS has been changed to respond to comments received regarding cost. The costs to transport mercury by truck have been revised. In addition, costs to transport mercury by rail have been added. Storage costs have been revised based on updated rental cost information. These changes appear in Section ES.6, Section 2.5, Section 4.1, and Appendix D.

Public comments on the Draft MM EIS are addressed in Volume II of the Final MM EIS, a new volume. Section 5.3 was revised to include the status of consultations related to ecological resources, cultural resources, and Native American rights. Correspondence related to the consultations are included in Appendix I, a new appendix. In addition, a number of minor editorial changes and corrections were made throughout the Final MM EIS.

1.8 REFERENCES

CEC (Commission of the European Communities), 2002, *Report from the Commission to the Council Concerning Mercury from the Chlor-Alkali Industry*, Brussels, June 9.

DLA (Defense Logistics Agency), 2003, *Federal Register*, "Notice of Availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement; Mercury Management," Defense National Stockpile Center, 68 FR 17786–17787, April 11.

DLA (Defense Logistics Agency), 2003, *Draft Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement*, Defense National Stockpile Center, Fort Belvoir, VA, April.

DLA (Defense Logistics Agency), 2004, *Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Report for the Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement*, Defense National Stockpile Center, Fort Belvoir, VA, April.

EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), 2003, *Federal Register*, "Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability," 68 FR 17801, April 11.

Chapter 2
Comment Documents and Responses

2.1 ORGANIZATION

This section provides a description of how the comments and the Defense National Stockpile Center's (DNSC's) responses are organized. Section 2.2 includes a copy of each comment document received, and Section 2.3 presents DNSC's response.

All those who submitted comments, both written and oral, are listed in Table 2–1. Commentors are alphabetically listed within one of the following groups: (1) members of the U.S. Congress and Federal agencies; (2) state and local officials, state agencies, Native American tribal governments, and nongovernmental organizations; (3) individuals; and (4) campaigns and petitions. Table 2–1 also provides comment document identification numbers, the page number where each comment document can be found, and the issue category code. Issue categories are coded to facilitate identification and tracking. For example, AC is the code for the "Alternative – Consolidated Storage" issue category, which is further divided into three sub-issues—General (AC-1), Hawthorne Army Depot (AC-2), and PEZ Lake Development (AC-3). Table 2–2 lists the individuals who submitted campaign letters or signed petitions.

A ***comment response*** is DNSC's written reply to a comment or group of comments submitted during the public comment period on the Draft MM EIS.

HOW CAN I FIND MY COMMENT AND DNSC'S RESPONSE?

- ✓ Refer to Table 2–1, which is organized alphabetically and grouped by affiliation (i.e., U.S. Congress and Federal agencies; state and local officials, state agencies, Native American tribal governments, and nongovernmental organizations; individuals; and campaigns and petitions).
- ✓ The columns next to names identify the comment document identification number, the page on which the comment document is presented, and the issue category codes. The issue category codes correspond to DNSC's responses in Section 2.3.
- ✓ Use Table 2–2 to find the issue category and the page on which the response is located. It also identifies other comment documents that contain similar comments.

Table 2–1. Index of Commentors

Commentor	Comment Document[a]	Page[b]	Issue Category Code[c]
Members of the U.S. Congress and Federal Agencies			
United States House of Representatives, Honorable Mike Ferguson, represented by Karen McClintock	166	2–216	AC-1
United States House of Representatives, Honorable Mark E. Souder	54	2–69	AC-1, OS-3, RA-1, SB-3, SE-2
United States House of Representatives, Honorable Mark E. Souder, represented by Mark Wickershaun	110	2–127	AC-1, OS-3, RA-1, SB-3, SE-2
United States Senate, Honorable Robert F. Bennett	150	2–203	PP-3
United States Senate, Honorable Richard G. Lugar	181	2–245	PP-2
United States Army HQ JMC - G4 Munitions Base Management Directorate, Jay Lundberg	22	2–34	NP-4
United States Department of the Interior, Willie R. Taylor	211	2–290	AC-2
United States Environmental Protection Agency, Anne Norton Miller	27	2–37	NP-2
United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Clifford G. Day	68	2–78	EC-3
United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Lynwood A. MacLean	95	2–102	EC-2
State and Local Officials, State Agencies, Native American Tribal Governments, and Nongovernmental Organizations			
Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials, Jennifer R. Kaduck	83	2–94	AE-2
Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen Bloom, Linda K. Irving, Marla J. Rousseau, Edwin J.	31	2–44	AC-1, RA-1, RA-2, RT-1, SB-1, SE-2
Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen, Marla Irving	124	2–159	AC-1, SE-2
Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen, Ed Rousseau	122	2–155	AC-1, SE-2
City of Akron, Frederick Neugebauer	73	2–86	AS-1, EP-1
City of New Haven, Honorable Terry McDonald	138	2–192	AC-1, OS-2, RA-1, SB-1, SE-2
City of New Haven, Honorable Terry E. McDonald	180	2–244	AC-1, SE-1, SE-2
City of New Haven, Honorable Terry E. McDonald	200	2–269	AC-1, SE-2
City of New Haven, Honorable Terry A. Werling	45	2–59	AC-1
City of New Haven, Honorable Terry Werling	127	2–164	AC-1
Common Council of the City of New Haven Adams, Brenda McDonald, Honorable Terry E.	33	2–48	AC-1, RA-1, SB-1, SE-2
Fort Wayne Common Council Crawford, Honorable John N. Hayhurst, Honorable Thomas E. Henry, Honorable Thomas C. Hines, Honorable Glynn A. Pape, Honorable Timothy M. Ravine, Honorable Rebecca J. Smith, Honorable Thomas E. Talarico, Honorable Samuel J.	182	2–246	AC-1, RA-1, SB-1, SE-2

Table 2–1. Index of Commentors (Continued)

Commentor	Comment Document[a]	Page[b]	Issue Category Code[c]
State and Local Officials, State Agencies, Native American Tribal Governments, and Nongovernmental Organizations (continued)			
Healthy Environment Alliance of Utah, Jason Groenewold	189	2–254	AE-1, AN-1, CB-1, DD-1, ER-1, OS-3, PO-3, PP-3, RA-1, RA-2, RT-1, SB-1, SB-2, SB-4, SE-2
Hillsborough Police Department, Chief Robert Gazaway	101	2–109	DM-1, RA-1
Hillsborough Township, Honorable Tony Gwiazdowski	163	2–206	AC-1, AN-1, SB-1
Hillsborough Township, Honorable Steven Sireci	167	2–218	AC-1, AP-1, DM-1
Hillsborough Township Committee, Sonya Martin	165	2–213	DM-1, PN-4, RT-1
Hillsborough Township Committee, John Souren	169	2–225	AC-1, RA-2
Indiana Department of Environmental Management, Lori F. Kaplan	53	2–67	AC-1, AS-1
Indiana Department of Environmental Management, Paula Smith	111	2–130	AC-1, AN-1, AS-1
Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Michael W. Neyer	85	2–98	EC-2, WR-2
Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Jon C. Smith	295	2–314	CR-5
Indiana State Senate, Honorable Bud Meeks	131	2–175	AC-1, OS-3, PP-1, RA-3, RN-1
Jefferson Township, Ron Hakes	118	2–146	PN-1, SB-1
Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, Honorable Arleen O'Donnell	201	2–270	AG-1, AP-1, AS-1, CB-3, SB-1
Nevada Department of Administration, Heather K. Elliott	106	2–116	AC-1, AC-2, EP-1, RE-1, WM-1, WR-1
Nevada Department of Cultural Affairs, Alice M. Baldrica	29	2–39	CR-3
New Haven Adams Township Fire Department, John Bennett	32	2–46	AN-1, DM-1, ER-1, RN-1, SB-1, SE-2
New Haven Chamber of Commerce Lash, Lawrence Oetting, Ronald K.	55	2–70	AC-1
New Haven Chamber of Commerce, Ron Oetting	115	2–140	AC-1
New Haven City Council, Honorable Tom C. Lewandowski	108	2–121	AC-1, OS-5, SE-2
New Haven City Council, Honorable Harold West	112	2–132	AC-1, RA-1, SB-3
New Haven, Indiana, Mayor's Advisory Council, Miranda Tompkins	133	2–180	RA-1
New Haven, Indiana, Mayor's Youth Advisory Committee, Alecia Martin	35	2–50	RN-1
New Haven, Indiana, Mayor's Youth Advisory Council, Alecia Martin	109	2–124	AC-1, RA-1, RE-2
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Dorothy P. Guzzo	294	2–313	CR-2
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Michael Valent	79	2–92	EC-3

Table 2–1. Index of Commentors (Continued)

Commentor	Comment Document[a]	Page[b]	Issue Category Code[c]
State and Local Officials, State Agencies, Native American Tribal Governments, and Nongovernmental Organizations (continued)			
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Hammond, Stephen B. Sama, Jeffrey J.	204	2–275	AC-1, AS-1, DM-2, PO-1, SE-2, WR-1
Oak Ridge Reservation Local Oversight Committee, Norman A. Mulvenon	148	2–201	AG-1, AG-2, PO-2
Ohio Department of Natural Resources Joe Mion	293	2–311	EC-4
Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, Graham E. Mitchell	205	2–277	AS-1, RN-3, RT-1
Ohio Historic Preservation Office, Julie Quinlan	26	2–36	CR-1
Regional Chamber, Ed Beil	72	2–84	AC-1, SB-1
Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, John A. Owsley	178	2–242	AP-1
Tennessee Historical Commission, Herbert L. Harper	28	2–38	CR-4
The Chlorine Institute, Inc., Arthur E. Dungan	146	2–198	AC-1, EO-1, PO-2, PP-1
Trumbull County Emergency Management Department (and Hazmat), Donald Waldron	48	2–62	SB-1
Trumbull County Hazmat (and Emergency Management Department), Don Waldron	74	2–88	AN-1
Quicksilver Caucus Chadwick, Cory R. Eagan, Lloyd L. Hammerschmidt, Ronald F. Kaduck, Jennifer Smith, Karen L.	174	2–237	AC-1, AS-1, PO-1, RP-1
Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Connie Rauen	6	2–27	SB-1
Utah State Senate, Honorable Ron Allen	145	2–197	WR-3
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Charles Ellis	25	2–35	AP-1
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Ellie L. Irons	30	2–40	RT-1
Walker River Paiute Tribe, Honorable Victoria Guzman	177	2–241	EP-2, RT-3
Walker River Paiute Tribe, Tad Williams	87	2–99	EP-2
Warren Fire Department, Captain Curtiss King	75	2–89	AS-1, RT-1
Wethersfield Township, James Stoddard	71	2–82	ER-1, SB-1
Individuals			
Allen, Cari	210	2–288	AC-1, AE-1, PP-6, RA-1, SB-1, SE-1
Altobelli, Anna	191	2–259	AC-1
Amato, Nicholas	61	2–75	AC-1
Ameliano, Mrs.	92	2–100	AC-1
Anonymous	24	2–34	AC-3
Anonymous	76	2–91	DM-3, OS-3, RN-1
Anonymous	81	2–93	AC-1
Anonymous	141	2–196	AC-1
Anonymous	144	2–196	AC-1

Table 2–1. Index of Commentors (Continued)

Commentor	Comment Document[a]	Page[b]	Issue Category Code[c]
Individuals (continued)			
Anonymous	152	2–204	AC-1, DM-3
Anonymous	153	2–204	AC-1
Anonymous	154	2–204	AC-1, DM-3
Anonymous	155	2–204	AC-1
Anonymous	157	2–204	AC-1
Anonymous	158	2–205	AC-1
Anonymous	159	2–205	AC-1
Anonymous	160	2–205	AC-1
Anonymous	217	2–294	SE-2
Anonymous	218	2–294	AC-1
Anonymous	223	2–295	AC-1
Anonymous	224	2–295	AC-1
Anonymous	227	2–295	AC-1
Anonymous	229	2–296	AC-1
Anonymous	232	2–296	AC-1
Anonymous	235	2–297	AC-1
Anonymous	236	2–297	AC-1
Anonymous	237	2–297	AC-1
Anonymous	239	2–297	AC-1
Anonymous	240	2–297	AC-1
Anonymous	241	2–297	AC-1
Anonymous	242	2–298	AC-1
Anonymous	243	2–298	ER-1, SB-1, WR-3
Anonymous	248	2–299	AC-1
Anonymous	249	2–299	AC-1
Anonymous	251	2–299	AC-1
Anonymous	254	2–300	AC-1, WM-1
Anonymous	255	2–300	AC-1
Anonymous	259	2–301	AC-1, WM-1
Anonymous	260	2–301	AC-1
Anonymous	261	2–301	AC-1, RN-2
Anonymous	264	2–302	AC-1
Anonymous	265	2–302	AC-1, AN-1
Anonymous	266	2–302	AC-1, WM-1
Anonymous	269	2–303	AC-1
Anonymous	270	2–303	AC-1
Anonymous	272	2–304	AC-1, SB-1
Anonymous	273	2–304	AC-1, WM-1
Anonymous	278	2–305	AC-1, WM-1
Anonymous	284	2–307	AC-1
Ashiolas, Karen	203	2–274	AC-1, RA-2
Atkinson, Christina	125	2–161	AC-1
Bancroft, Trudy	231	2–296	AN-1
Barron, Raina	271	2–303	AC-1, PP-1, PP-5
Bedwell, John C.	37	2–52	AP-1
Bedwell, John	126	2–162	WR-1
Bedwell, Karen A.	56	2–72	AE-2, CB-1, DD-1, DM-2, PN-1, PN-2, RA-1, SE-2

Table 2–1. Index of Commentors (Continued)

Commentor	Comment Document[a]	Page[b]	Issue Category Code[c]
Individuals (continued)			
Bedwell, Karen	113	2–135	AE-2, CB-1, DD-1, DM-2, PN-1, PN-2, RA-1, SE-2
Bish, Margaret	275	2–304	AC-1, RN-2
Bookmiller, Sarah	215	2–294	AC-1
Bosworth, Jeff	257	2–300	AC-1
Brown, Berenice	117	2–144	AC-1, DM-2, RA-1, RA-3, RT-1, SB-1, SE-2
Brown, John	116	2–142	PN-2
Brown, Ray	279	2–306	AC-1
Brown, Sally M.	88	2–99	AC-1
Bruick, Mark	121	2–153	AC-1, AS-1
Butler, Traci and Michael	185	2–251	AC-1, AN-1
Cabrera, Paula	93	2–100	AC-1
Carpenter, Terry	99	2–106	AC-1
Chaffie, Neil	19	2–32	AC-3
Chapman, Tom	287	2–308	AC-1, AE-1
Christianson, Zachary	262	2–302	AC-1, WM-1
Clayton, Roger	65	2–75	PN-1
Clea, Violet	193	2–261	AC-1
Copenhaver, Louise	49	2–63	AN-1
Crovert, Jacob	258	2–301	AC-1, PN-2
Dager, Ronald F.	43	2–58	AC-1
Dager, Sandra A.	44	2–58	AC-1
Dager, Sandra	134	2–181	AS-1, PN-2
Dewey, Trevor	123	2–157	AC-1, RA-1
Dian, Julia	172	2–233	AC-1, AC-3
Dimitrov-Kuhl, Margauth	64	2–75	AC-1, DM-2
Dimitrov-Kuhl, Margauth	70	2–81	AC-1, DM-1, RA-1
Downs, Bettie	46	2–60	DM-1, PP-4, RN-1
Dvorin, Lisa	186	2–251	AC-1
Elder, Adam	245	2–298	AC-1, OS-3
Ellington, Col. (Ret.) W.E.	139	2–196	DM-1
Endicott, Mary	202	2–273	AC-1, RA-1, RN-2
Fitzpatrick, Tom	102	2–111	AE-1
Florin, Alecia	94	2–101	AC-1
Fort Wayne, R.G.W.	14	2–31	PN-2
Foss, David	164	2–211	AC-1, AE-1, CB-1, CB-3, SE-2
Funk, Kathy	225	2–295	AC-1
Gallo, Joseph	90	2–99	AC-1
Gawarecki, Susan	207	2–280	AG-2, AS-1
Gilbert, David	42	2–57	SE-2
Gonzales, Nicole	290	2–309	AC-1, AE-1, SB-2
Gorgy, Diane	20	2–32	AC-1, WR-1
Gorgy, Diane	58	2–73	DM-2, RA-2, WR-1
Gosselin, Dr. Edward	103	2–112	RA-1
Gottschalt, Mr.	135	2–183	RA-3
Greco-Nieland, Danielle	80	2–93	AC-1
Greene, Eileen	277	2–305	AC-1, AE-1, RT-1

Table 2–1. Index of Commentors (Continued)

Commentor	Comment Document[a]	Page[b]	Issue Category Code[c]
Individuals (continued)			
Groll, Cherie	233	2–296	AC-1
Hamatake, Richard	162	2–205	PN-2
Hanley, Diane	253	2–299	AC-1
Hanmann, Jeff	59	2–73	AN-1, ER-2, WM-1
Hanson, Amanda	230	2–296	AC-1
Hanson, Amanda	244	2–298	AC-1
Harrell, Janna	286	2–308	AC-1
Harris, Chantelle E.	11	2–30	AC-1, SE-2
Harris, Frankie	228	2–296	AC-1
Havet, Janet	62	2–75	AC-1
Haymond, John C.	285	2–308	AC-1
Heathcock, Jessica	247	2–298	AC-1, SE-2
Hendricks, Mary	151	2–204	AC-1
Hermann, Dale and Joan	175	2–239	AS-1, CB-1, EC-1, PN-1, RA-1, SE-2
Hitzemann, Cheryl	130	2–171	AS-1, NP-1, PN-1, SE-1, SE-2
Hughes, Robert	39	2–54	AC-1
Hutchinson, Christine	89	2–99	AC-1
Jewell, Lillian C.	188	2–253	AC-1
Johnson, Michael R.	291	2–309	AC-1, AE-1, AP-1, CB-1, CB-3, SB-1, SE-2
Johnson, Robert	267	2–302	AC-1
Jones, Kelly	214	2–294	AC-1, SE-2
Jones, Kimberly	192	2–260	RN-1
Jones, Merle	238	2–297	AN-1
Jones, Wayne D.	280	2–306	SE-1, SE-2
Keel, Shirley	256	2–300	AC-1, AN-1, WM-1
Kennerk, Ms.	136	2–185	AS-1, PN-2, RA-1
Kevin	16	2–31	AC-1, WM-1
King, Captain Curtiss C.	7	2–28	AE-2, AP-1, ER-1, PN-2, PN-3, RT-1, SB-3, SE-1
Kinney, Rick	137	2–187	AC-1, OS-2, OS-4, OS-5, SE-2
Klepich, Cindy	168	2–221	AC-1, AG-1, RA-1
Klotz, Edward	114	2–138	AC-1, SB-1, SB-3
Knowlton, Douglas	10	2–29	AC-1
Kowacich, James	199	2–268	AC-1
Kratovil, Charles	173	2–235	AC-1, OS-1
Krueckeberg, Melvin	36	2–51	CB-1, RN-1
Krueckeberg, Melvin	129	2–169	RN-1
Kurek, M. Lynn	66	2–76	AC-1, EC-1, RA-2, SE-2
Lady, Richard	206	2–279	AG-2
Lichfield, Karen	142	2–196	AC-1
Lindsey	220	2–294	AC-1
Lobdell, Louis L.	5	2–27	AC-3
Loeschner, Steve	3	2–27	PN-2, PO-2
Loeschner, Steve	128	2–166	AC-1, PP-1, RA-1
Longo, Gene	51	2–65	AN-1
Longo, Ruth	52	2–66	AN-1

Table 2–1. Index of Commentors (Continued)

Commentor	Comment Document[a]	Page[b]	Issue Category Code[c]
Individuals (continued)			
Luce-Turner, Barbra	12	2–30	AC-1
Lyon, Deon	149	2–202	AC-1, AN-1
Lyons, Kevin	86	2–99	AC-1
Mallet, Pamela A.	283	2–307	AC-1, SE-2, WM-1
Mansfield, Tyler	119	2–148	AC-1, SE-1
Marshall, Mr.	234	2–296	AC-1, OS-3
Mazza, Jerry	147	2–200	AP-2
McGuire, John	23	2–34	AC-3
McKnight, Barbara	18	2–31	AC-3
McLeary, Lisa	246	2–298	AC-1
McLeary, Lisa	250	2–299	AC-1
McLeary, Lisa	252	2–299	AC-1
Medina, Veronica	216	2–294	AC-1
Meyer, Madonna Harrington	4	2–27	AC-3
Miles, Mitchell	63	2–75	AC-1
Miller, Dorothy	161	2–205	DM-3, PP-5
Molly	289	2–309	AC-1, RA-1, SB-2
Moore, Brian	143	2–196	AC-1, RA-1, RT-1
Murray, Christine	198	2–266	AC-1
Myers, Mark	221	2–295	AC-1
Mymo, Betty	194	2–262	AC-1, RA-2
Mymo, Carl	195	2–263	AC-1
Nelson, Bob	9	2–29	AC-1, CB-1, RA-1, RA-3
Nelson, Marian	8	2–29	AC-1
Norton, Nancy	104	2–114	RT-1
Pascarella, Monell	47	2–61	AN-1
Peck, Patty	140	2–196	AC-1
Persson, Ruth G.	282	2–307	AC-1, WM-1
Pinckney, Debbie	156	2–204	AC-1
Pittano, Linda	50	2–64	AN-1
Reiter, Lori	190	2–258	RN-1
Renfrow, Susie	38	2–53	DM-3
Roberts, Brian	292	2–310	AS-1, CB-2, RA-2
Salamone, Roseanne	78	2–91	AC-1
Sarah	263	2–302	AC-1
Sassell, Maxine	91	2–100	AC-1
Savastano, Jamie	57	2–73	AC-1
Schafbuch, Karen	40	2–55	AC-1
Schiel, Tim	34	2–49	PN-2
Shaw, Jim and Lynn	13	2–30	AC-1, AE-1
Shearer, James F.	15	2–31	AC-1, RT-1
Sheets, Loris A.	209	2–285	AC-1
Shifley, Dorothy	1	2–23	AC-1, AN-1, RA-1, SE-2
Shimshock, Dr. Steve	170	2–228	AC-1, AE-1, AS-1, OS-3
Shinton, Harry	274	2–304	AC-1
Shobel, Sam	196	2–264	EC-1, RE-1
Silva, Valarie J. and Andrew	84	2–96	AC-1, RA-1
Smith, David B.	212	2–292	AC-2, DD-1
Smith, Gordon and Kay	105	2–115	AC-1

Table 2–1. Index of Commentors (Continued)

Commentor	Comment Document[a]	Page[b]	Issue Category Code[c]
Individuals (continued)			
Smith, Jackie	98	2–105	AC-1
Spencer, Cameron	288	2–308	AC-1, AN-1, RT-1
Stevenson, John	97	2–105	AC-1
Steward, Clint	222	2–295	AC-1
Stratton, Scott	276	2–305	AC-1, WM-1
Stredney, Edward	187	2–252	AC-1
Sullivan, Nancy	21	2–33	AC-1
Tarbell, Barbara	82	2–93	AC-1
Taylor, Paul	120	2–149	AC-1
Telford, Brett and Heather	281	2–307	AC-1, WM-1
Telshaw, Dorothy C.	197	2–265	RN-1
Timmons, Pamela	219	2–294	AC-1
Timmons, Pamela	226	2–295	AC-1
Tomlin, Jean	213	2–293	AE-1, ER-2
Urena, Rudy	77	2–91	AC-1
Van Zandt, Allison	69	2–80	AC-1
Van Zandt, Allison	179	2–243	AC-1, WR-1
Walker, Christen	17	2–31	AC-1, SB-1
Walton, Barbara	208	2–282	AC-1, CB-1, PO-1, PP-1
Wartenberg, Dan	171	2–230	AC-1, NP-3, NP-5
Webster, James D.	2	2–24	AC-1, LU-2, NP-1, PP-1, SE-1, SE-2
Weerts, Gretchen	132	2–178	PP-1, OS-3
Winters, Steven	268	2–303	AC-1
Young, David	107	2–119	RT-2, SB-2
Zakaluk, Marie	60	2–74	AC-1, NP-1
Zakaluk, Marie	100	2–107	CR-2, LU-1
Zaslow, Maxine R.	96	2–104	AC-1, RA-1
Zaslow, Maxine R.	176	2–240	AC-1
Zeigler, Tammy	41	2–56	AC-1, OS-3
Campaigns and Petitions			
Campaign: Support for the Consolidated Storage Alternative	67	2–77	AC-1
Petition: Remove all Mercury Stored in Hillsborough, New Jersey	183	2–248	AC-1, DM-3
Petition: Strong Opposition to Consolidated Mercury Storage at the New Haven Depot—Adult Community Members	184A	2–249	AC-1
Petition: Strong Opposition to Consolidated Mercury Storage at the New Haven Depot—Future Leaders of the Community	184B	2–250	AC-1

[a] Identification number assigned to the comment documents.

[b] Page numbers indicate the location of the comment documents in Section 2.2.

[c] The issue category code corresponds to the Defense National Stockpile Center's response in Section 2.3.

Table 2–2. Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign or Petition

Campaign: Support for the Consolidated Storage Alternative (Comment Document No. 67)		
Anderson, Kelly	Glander, Donn	Nolan, Elizabeth Gaudet
Anderson, Mariann	Haltmeier, Patricia	North, Elizabeth C.
Barthel, Rand and Carolyn	Hicks, Patricia W.	Ogg, Russell
Bertone, Ann	Houghton, Jeanne	Panci, John
Bibbo, Nicki	Iacono, Stephanie	Parsons, James
Burke, William	Inslee, Elinore	Piper, Margaret
Callais, Leslie	Jurdana, Joseph E.	Rasmussen, Peggy
Cezar, Jana	Kamel, Dr. Fayza	Reese, Judith
Chase, Philip and Deidre	Kane, Eleanore	Ryon, Diana
Coleman, Eileen	Kaufman, Kim	Sage, Sharon
Cowardin, Sam	Kennedy, Virginia	Schmidt, Gerald
Daniels, Mary and Neal	Knoll, Tom	Schwabe, Karl
DeFrank, Jamie and John	Kosier, Celina	Simpson, Kathleen
Dobie, Kathleen	Linne, Thomas Marc	Squires, Suzanne
Donabedian, Armen	Luxon, Paul and Kris	Stabile, Anita
Eckersley, Dika and Richard	McLin, Renee	Strack, K.J.
Estes, Lane	Micklos, Charlotte G.	Trotter, Shirley
Everett, Carol	Miller, Contance	Wadsworth, Joan
Feulner, Qandra	Miller, Kenneth and Marcia	Weirauch, Jeanne
Fowler, Lillian	Mourik, Joyce J.	Westwood, Ardis
Frame, Larry	Muchow, Rosemary	Winkelman, Helen
Frank, Ann	Newton, Audrey A.	Winkelmann, Marina
Frederick, Janet	Nixon, Hal	
Petition: Remove all Mercury Stored in Hillsborough, New Jersey (Comment Document No. 183)		
Aboussein, Shahin	Argueta, George	Bicsok, Ilona
Abraham, Arnold	Arias, A.	Bielanski, R.
Abramson, Gary	Arimenta, Joyce	Bilmorik, Maheyar
Abtisean, Mike	Arnold, Annette	Birrell, Charles
Acosta, Enrique	Aslam, Zohra	Bisaghi, Thomas P.
Adamo, Kay	Aubuschinou, David	Bisberg, Meryl
Adelson, Lisa	Backman, Charles C.	Bizzoco, Connie
Adornato, Salvatore	Baker, Debbie	Blackwell, Samuel
Ageis, Gladys	Baker, Robert P.	Blakeslee, Renee
Agosta, Mariangela	Bal, Patricia	Blakeslee, Richard
Alder, Anne	Ball, Jean	Bocher, Diane
Alexis, N.	Barry, Ed	Bogar, Mary Ann
Alphas, Stacey	Barstow, Barbara	Bolton, John
Ambrose, Michael	Bartholomew, Dennis	Bonhorst, Karen
Amda, James	Batzer, Kathy	Boon, Marlene
Amin, L.	Bauer, Danna	Boorne, Angela
Amocko, Oset	Beacht, Carolyn	Bottcher, Christina
Anderson, Katherine	Beel, Lee	Boud, Shirley
Anderson, Kenya	Beers, James	Bove, Ronald
Anderson, Linda	Bellantuono, Roz	Boyd, Dennis
Anderson, Mariela	Benadon, Dave	Boyda, Kathleen
Andio, Dave	Benadon, Emily	Braby, Randy
Andio, Louis	Bench, Grace	Brea, John
Anguili, Maria	Benney, Diane	Brischler, Mike
Applegate, Cathy	Beresford, M.	Brisebois, Chris
Appuzo, Charles J.	Berk, Christine	Brisset, L.
Araneo, Johnna	Berkid, Velika	Brommer, Edwin
Argen, David	Bertin, Edward	Brooks, Lorne
Argen, Pamela	Bianchin, Joe	Brown, Kandis

Table 2–2. Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign or Petition (Continued)

Petition: Remove all Mercury Stored in Hillsborough, New Jersey (Comment Document No. 183) (continued)

Browning, Dorothy
Brownlie, Doug
Bruce, Thomas
Bryant, Reid
Buccino, Mary Ann
Buccoleri, Dominick
Buckley, Dawn
Buckley, Pat
Bufugle, Ruth
Burger, Angela
Burgmiller, Lewis
Burgos, Marcos
Burke, Gail
Burns, Thomas
Burrell, Lurena
Burton-Mason, H.
Busa, Tony
Butcher, Mary
Butler, Maureen
Byrne, Donna
Camillo, Tony
Campbell, Roxanne
Caneo, Christopher
Cann, G.
Capozzi, Justin
Capra, Judy
Carbonaro, Dianne
Carey, Carol Anne
Carisle, G.
Carlson, Art
Carmen, Joyce
Carney, John
Carorillano, James
Carrig, Rob
Carvelli, Roseanne
Cary, Roland
Cascaes, Ellen
Cascaes, Phil
Castro, Luis
Castro, Magali
Caumpert, Gerald
Cecihine, Carol
Cesta, Nancy
Cetola, Ann
Chang, Bill
Chang, Man Chirg
Chapman, Jeanne
Chapman, Thomas
Cheremsok, Terry
Chiange, Jorge
Choida, Kathleen
Chowanski, Harry
Chrizan, Gilda
Chrowosky, Nicky
Cimato, Kathy
Cipollini, Karyn
Cleaver, Kerry
Cliggert, Richard
Coates, Tom
Coehran, Cindy
Coelho, Sueli
Cohen, David
Collins, Susan W.
Commentzig, D.J.
Comsudis, Elaine
Conaver, Susan
Conaway, Tynisha
Concannon, Diane
Conlon, Tim
Connelly, Pat
Conway, Michele
Cooke, Joe
Coppola, Danielle
Corson, Ruth
Cosari, Cathy
Coslett, Celia
Courids, Don
Cover, Jack
Cox, Ellen
Cox, George
Cremikowski, Irene
Criaris, Basil
Crisatiello, Ann
Cronin, Heather
Cronin, Thomas R.
Crosdale, Michael
Crow, Carla
Cruver, Olive M.
Cunningham, James
D'Adamo, Amadeo
D'Agostine, Kayce
D'Agostino, Angela
Dahlstrom, Teresa
Danberry, Cindy
Danko, Charles
Dansak, Richard
Davidovich, JoAnn
Davis, Martha A.
Davis, Sara
Daylor, Lisa
De la Rosa, Josede
Poortere, Terri
Decker, Donald
DeGrasse, Kimberly
Del Vento, Len
Del Vento, Marge
DellaBella, Marc
Delos Santos, Genevieve
DeLuca, Michelle
DeLucci, Donna
DeMaio, Linda
deMaio, Suzanne
DeMelie, Joan
Dennis, Barbara
Denz, Jeff F.
Denz, Krystal
Deryl, Robin
DeScula, Paul
Devereaux, Rhonda
Diaz, Georgina
Diaz, Luis
Dicenzo, Wayne
Dier, Rich
Digian, Sarina
DiGiovanni, Rita
Dillaine, Irma
DiNardo, Lynn
DiRosa, Joyce
Dittmeier, Raymond
Dittus, Jami
DiTunnariello, Jerry
Dixon, Deborah M.
Dolan, Jill
Donnelly, Dawn
Donovan, Tom
Donst, Michael
Dorn, Jennifer
Dorsey, Kevin
Doty, Michael
Downey, Vincent
Dragity, Linda
Druetor, Gerri
Duesada, Zaida
Duff, Howard
Dukas, Matt
Duke, Raul
Dukette, Jacdyn
Dunn, Arthur
Dunst, Rachel
Durka, Jan
Durso, Mary
Dvorsky, Zuzana
Dylo, Stanley
Easly, Leona
Eblin, Karen
Edelstein, Joy
Ehraasi, Frederick
Ehrhardt, Rina
Eilbacher, Michelle

Table 2–2. Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign or Petition (Continued)

Petition: Remove all Mercury Stored in Hillsborough, New Jersey (Comment Document No. 183) (continued)		
Ello, Emanuelle	Fulbearn, Georgia	Haas, Liang
Elmer, Blasi	Fuller, Nicky	Hafeez, Abid
Engelhardt, Steve	Gabriel, Dominador	Hala, Fawn
Enright, Kerri	Gahrmann, Natalie	Hambrecht, Diana
Epstein, Susan	Galanowsky, Sharen	Hamleh, Kim
Escamilla, Gerardo	Gale, Beth	Hamren, Denise
Esquirad, Ismad	Gallagher, Gregg	Han, Maggie
Esterman, Rona	Gangaware, Don	Hanna, Samia
Estreicher, Jackie	Gange, Judith	Harding, Lore
Estreicher, Sidney	Garefino, John	Harris, Kimberly
Everett, Wayne	Garthan, Elizabeth	Harrity, Elizabeth
Fabricatae, Deb	Gendrano, Juliane	Haskins, Moyette
Fagen, Samantha	Gerhardt, Patricia	Hatangaeli, Sofia
Fahsbander, Josh	Ghana, Mumeeb	Haterell, Mildred
Failliace, Carmen	Gibbs, Charles	Haurilla, Paul
Farber, Joanne	Gibbs, Eric	Hawzen, Gary
Faridy, Syeda	Giles, Shirley	Healy, Carleen
Farren, Jyll	Gilkeson, Russ	Heatherington, Lori
Fay, Sally	Gillespie, Barbara	Heekim, Nam
Fazzolari, Rosa	Gilmore, Carl	Heinowitz, Jerry
Fedder, Nancy	Gingell, Kelly J.	Held, Helen
Fede, J.	Gingros, Steven P.	Helmacy, Ann Marie
Fedor, Deborah	Gionis, Tina	Helmacy, Doug
Feldman, Jennifer	Giordaro, Donna	Helmbrecht, Robert
Fenimore, Vincent	Godby, Joe	Helmoll, Suzanne
Fernaudy, Alicia	Goldberg, Lisa A.	Henderson, Robert
Ferrante, Michelle	Goldsmith, Ellen	Hendrickson, Lee
Ferrara, Nicole	Goldstone, Mark	Herbel, Kathy
Ferretti, Sherry	Gonzalez, Paul	Herrod, L.
Feygenson, Sofia	Gonzalez, Sharon	Herron, Susan
Findley, Glenn	Gonzalez, Yvonne	Hersberger, Rita
Fink, David	Gooch, Kathryn	Heyder, Leeanne
Finnigan, Joe	Gotfried, Joan	Hidalgo, Caroline
Firley, Lila	Gradker, Jon	Higgins, C.
Fischer, Sandra	Grant, Thomas	Hill, Jance M.
Fitch, Colleen	Gratkowski, Rosetta	Hirsch, Charles
Fitzgerald, Lori	Gratz, Toni	Hittner, L.
Fitzimmons, William	Green, Linda S.	Hoak, Judy
Flanagan, Emily	Greenhut, Robert	Hoffer, Richard
Ford, Jim	Greenwood, Steven	Hoffman, Anne
Forden, Joan	Grieco, Angela	Hoffman, Randall
Fosler-Lewis, Daniel	Groelly, Tara	Holman, Lynn
Foster, Joann	Gromosaik, Daniel	Hood, Michael
Fox, James	Gromosiak, Rudy	Hopkins, Leon
Fox, Robert	Grossano, Randine	Hored, John
Francisco, Z.	Grossman, Doug	Horn, Arnold
Franzoso, Tara	Gruemloh, Marilyn	Horowitz, Sanna
Fraticelli, Roy	Guastella, Lisa	Horrich, Eleanor
Frazier, Krystal	Guilman, Kathy	Horst, Marcia
Fredericks, Jennifer	Guimano, Denise	Hossami, Benakesh
Freitag, Joan T.	Gutman, Inez	Hough, Bill
Frias, Christian	Guzman, Xenia	Houllihan, Iris
Friender, Paula	Gwiazadowsla, Anthony	Howard, Terry

Table 2–2. Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign or Petition (Continued)

Petition: Remove all Mercury Stored in Hillsborough, New Jersey (Comment Document No. 183) (continued)		
Huaser, Julie	Klein, Mark	Lee, Elliot
Hues, Christine	Klein, Nancy	Lee, Ken
Hunt, Catherine	Klinger, Pam	Leffler, Vera
Hussain, Talib	Kluber, Gary	Len, A.
Hussein, Syed	Klucher, Linda	Lesko, Kathy
Ifan, Iwonese	Knapp, Christina	Leven, Jean
Illegible (14)	Knapp, Herman	Levenburg, Richard
Ilvento, Marilyn	Kness, Catherine	Levie, Johanna
Imbimbo, Dawn	Koch, Linda	Levin, Gad
Jacaouso, Natalie	Koch, Roger	Levy, Ron
Jackson, Ina	Kochis, George	Lew, Jason
Jaegly, Margaret	Komor, Rita	Lewis, Michael
Jalukowicz, Leonard	Koot, Joan	Limyanksy, Lisa
Janiel, Frank	Korostaff, Matt	Lindsey-Mathews, F.
Janiel, Jo	Korostoff, Stephanie	Lindstrom, Theresa
Jenson, Charles L.	Kosec, Michael	Lipton, Michael
Jess, Thomas	Kostanek, Doris	Loayza, Gilda
Jew, Rita	Kraft, Richard P.	Lobasik, K.
Jijones, Carolyn	Krals, Willie	Loll, Gerald L.
Johnson, Randall	Kravitz, Arthur	Lombardi, Ralph
Jones, Delphine	Kravitz, Bonita	Long, Glenn
Jones, Joni	Kreindel, Bill	Long, Michael
Jones, Leslie	Kresefsky, Ellie	Lopes, A.
Jones, Richard	Krol, Kristine	Lopez, Ariel
Joseph, Stephen	Kruchow, Swiatoslaw	Lopez, Laura C.
Joubert, Connie	Kubian, Dorothy	Loprista, Anne
Julian, Estell	Kubowski, Tara	Lorai, Nancy
Kaminski, Erin	Kuchne, Mike	Lorenson, Richard
Kansagor, Arthur	Kumar, Ashwalli	Los, Theresa
Kansagor, Toby	Kunst, John	Lott, Joan
Kapelewska, Wioleta	Kusina, Michael	Louis, Vetri
Kaplan, Vanessa	Kuzio, Barbara	Lu, Mengshi
Karan, Ellen	LaCicero, Maria	Lucarelli, Gloria Jean
Karluk, Nicole	LaCicero, Steve	Ludrigsen, Phil
Karonato, Mira	Lamastra, Ron	Lui, Rui
Karuaser, Slawa	Lambo, Allison	Lukach, Maryann
Kasat, Radhakrishna	Lambo, Karen	Lukczik, Gesage
Keaveney, Rachel	Lamonica, Susan	Luna, Noemy
Keitel, Russell	Lane, Jeff	Lupo, Carole
Keller, Heinz	Langdana, Farrokh	Lydon, Kevin
Kelly, Deidre	LaRusa, Leonard	Lynnett, Rodney
Kelly, Joseph	Lasota, Marc	Lyon, Rebecca
Kelly, Mary B.	Lassaro, Angela	Lysko, Gene S.
Kelly, Rose	Latella, Antoinette	MacCrea, Steve
Kensinger, Kathy	Lavere, Philip M.	Maceolo, Jean
Kern, Patricia L.	Lawrence, Robert	Maghdor, Carol
Khan, Micael	Lawyer, Jane	Mahoney, Gregory
Kim, Debi	Lazanta, David	Makarenic, Jill
Kim, Steven	Lazar, Lynne	Malda, Maria
Kimmelman, Robin	Lazicky, Kelly	Malesko, Allison
Kimor, Rosalyn	Leaper, Kathleen	Mallozzi, Julia
Kissell, John	LeBoent, Alan	Malone, Renee
Kizzle, John	Leccese, Maureen	Maloney, Linda

Table 2–2. Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign or Petition (Continued)

Petition: Remove all Mercury Stored in Hillsborough, New Jersey (Comment Document No. 183) (continued)

Maneilla, Hugo
Mangano, Margaret
Mannino, Grace
Mantz, Mary Anne
Marabella, Susan
Mardone, Anne
Marks, Ronnie
Marning, Sonia
Maroney, Ana
Marshall, Jan
Marshall, Mellissa
Martinez, Ines
Martinez, Juan
Maslyn, Janine
Massi, Mary
Mathisen, Patricia
May, Doborah
Mayes, Veronica
Mayrides, Miriam
Mazza, Jerry
Mazzarella, Francine
Mazzella, Joe
Mazzulla, Christina
McAloon, Laryssa
McCartney, Jean
McCombie, Bill
McCormick, Ryan
McCusker, Stan
McDowell, Janet
McFaddle, Margaret
McHaelson, Victor
McHale, Richard
McLaughlin, Donna L.
McLaughlin, Kathleen
McLaughlin, Thomas
McMahon, Rita L.
McNicol, Jennifer G.
McSherry, Joan
Meany, Mary
Mediiz, Helmuth
Meier, Barbara
Meier, Richard
Melinchuck, Bill
Meltzer, Maggie
Menafro, Mark V.
Merritt, Mechelle
Metcalfe, Edmund
Meyer, Nancy
Meyer, Pam
Michaels, Jeff
Michel, Debbie
Mieglas, Jim
Mignella, MaryAnn
Mihailoff, George
Mikolajczyk, Janet
Mikrit, Blanche
Miller, Carol
Miller, Ellan
Miller, Lorin
Minichini, Paula
Mint, Adrienne
Mint, Mary
Minter, Glenn
Mitchell, Grant
Mizewski, Marilyn
Moeller, Barbara
Mohandas, Nirajana
Molisso, Mary
Mollach, Helen
Mongley, Jacqueline
Monk, Lynne
Monks, Todd
Mooney, Kim
Moore, Dennis
Moran, Judy
Moser, Virginia
Muhlhausen, Kathleen
Munley, Michael
Murphy, George
Murray, Lori
Mussagli, Joan
Muth, Kassie
Myer, Gayle
Myers, Christine
Nagy, Allan
Nardi, Jessica
Nasello, Monique
Nast, Elizabeth
Natali, Augustus
Natchuras, Mark
Neal, Herman
Neall, Ronald
Nebsha, Michael
Nelson, Deidre
Nesty, Ferngudo
Netsko, Fran
New, Earl
Nguyen, Tom
Nieves, Victore
Nivison, Patricia
Nogal, Kimberly
Norcia, Anthony
Obermeier, Mary
O'Connor, Carmelina
O'Donnell, Marlene
O'Donnell, Tom
O'Kenny, Deborah
Oldenbury, Rose
Olear, Leslie
Olivara, Linda
Olivola, Linda
Olszyk, Christine
Omdal, Charlotte
O'Neil, Barbara
Onova, Kate
Opie, Wendy
Ortega, Amanda
Oryniak, Thomas
Osbourne, Antonio
Osei, Amma
Osmond, Gerard
Osterhoudt, Carol
Ottino, JoAnn
Pace, Danielle
Pace, Peter
Paidipalli, Madlain
Pakozdi, Frank
Palaparthi, Venu
Palatino, Laura
Palazzo, Madeline
Palumbo, Dom
Pancoast, Darla
Pankowski, Sue
Parich, Helen
Parker, Plyush
Parlin, Laurie
Pastor, Rebecca
Patel, Viren
Patella, Sandra
Pearson, Mary
Pedrick, Lou
Pelleta, Mary
Pellicane, Michael
Pellichero, Karen
Perlitz, Thomas
Pernot, Pamela
Peroira, Zewa
Perovich, Dottie
Pesarchick, Joe
Peterman, Rob
Peterson, Nanette
Peterson, Susan
Petrosio, Joseph A.
Petz, Ellie
Pewitt, W. Timothy
Phillips, Marjorie
Piercey, Tracy
Pieretti, John
Pikulin, Jackie

Table 2–2. Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign or Petition (Continued)

Petition: Remove all Mercury Stored in Hillsborough, New Jersey (Comment Document No. 183) (continued)		
Pinchersky, Alex	Risches, Nicole	Schmake, Jim
Pinzolat, Lon	Rista, Michele	Schmidt, Greg
Pira, Eveyln	Ritz, Paul	Schmidt, M.
Pisciotta, Kathleen	Robbias, Todd	Schmidt, Max
Plesh, Tony	Rock, David	Schmitt, Sharon
Poletti, Anne	Rodriguez, Carol	Schneider, Ron
Polk, D.	Rofsky, Vanessa	Schorr, Matt
Pollay, Thea	Rogers, Liz	Schramm, Kathy
Polnasek, Helen	Rohr, Tamie L.	Schultheis, Lisa R.
Pongruzzi, Sharon	Rolls, Peter J.	Schultheiss, Rosemary
Porink, Sylvia	Romanowski, Cathleen	Schultz, Kenneth
Powell, Rose Marie	Rosario, Myrna	Schwartz, Bryan
Prentice, Joana	Rosen, Norman	Schwartz, Geoffrey
Pristas, Susan	Rosenlicht, Joe	Schwartz, Jim
Pryor, Jennifer	Rosenthal, Eric	Schwertfeyer, Donald
Pu, Shaoyu	Rosenthal, Matt	Scisorek, Kim
Puccio, Grace	Ruben, Jann	Scott, Len
Puglisi, Patricia	Rubin, Jim	Scott, Lori
Pulio, Carol	Rubritz, Hyman	Scrivanich, Lora
Puntari, Elizabeth	Rukorourki, Joan	Seery, Lisa
Puza, Michael J.	Ryan, Maggie	Seguine, Lynn
Pyzik, Janell	Sadler, Dawn	Seller, Patricia
Quen, Jerry	Sadler, Laura	Serido, Lauren
Quick, Don	Saharko, Michael	Serpe-Pinkney, Deborah
Quick, Josephine	Sak, Lillian A.	Shah, D.
Quintero, Kelly	Salady, Beth	Shander, Arthur
Raab, Jim	Salek, John	Shapiro, Alan
Raber, Marie	Salitt, Farid	Sharma, Adarsh
Raczynski, Kathryn	Salkowitz, Alex	Shatch, Amin
Ragsdale, Erna	Salvatore, Marian	Sherman, Donna
Ralinkaj, Marcy	Samora, Karla	Sherman, Gregory
Ramachandra, Sridhar	Sanders, Ardele	Sherwood, Ada
Ramos, A.	Sanders, Rachel	Sherwood, Robert
Randall, Jeanette	Sanford, Neil	Shirazi, Jalir
Randolph, Audrey	Sannone, Anne	Sickler, Blanche
Randolph, Leah	Santamaria, Monica A.	Siebert, Kevin
Rapkia, Wendy	Santoro, Denise	Siegel, Ruth M.
Rasimowicz, Dianne	Santoro, Karen	Silva, Jorge
Ray, Lynette	Santoromita, Lee	Silver, Karen
Raymond, Christine	Santos, Cynthia	Silverman, Christine
Razor, Gary	Sardinis, C.	Singer, Judy
Reagel, Tina	Sarkodiek, Yaw	Sinibaldi, Phil
Reed, Jim	Sarola, Ranier	Sitts, Ron
Regg, Nancy	Sarshad, Nadder	Siverly, James R.
Reid, Cicero	Sattar, Wahid	Slar, A.P.
Reidy, Patrick	Sayla, James	Slarano, Wayne
Reimer, David	Sayle, Darryle	Slego, Peter
Reinhardt, Sharon	Scangamor, Eleanor	Sloan, Cheryl
Renner, Ross	Scarpa, Denise	Smethers, Geida
Rette, Anidan	Scerbi, Joseph	Smilowitz, Howard
Riga, Tina	Scheetz, Martha	Smith, Anne
Rind, Eileen	Schemm, Christina	Smith, Chris
Rinn, Susan	Schlemer, Marilyn	Smith, Gwenn

Table 2–2. Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign or Petition (Continued)

Petition: Remove all Mercury Stored in Hillsborough, New Jersey (Comment Document No. 183) (continued)		
Smith, Jeff	Thomas, Randy	Ward, Judy
Smith, Johnathon	Thompson, Helga	Ward, Susan
Smith, Valerie	Thrash, Jim	Warianka, Kristina
Snipes, Carl B.	Tisanolini, John	Warianka, Margaret
Sorrentino, Ralph	Tobia, Regina	Wawtroslk, Margaret
Sozanne, Marcy	Tomczyk, Annette	Weidner, Kathryn
Spiotta, Marianne	Tomko, Glen	Weigard, Stacy
Sprovieri, John	Torgerson, Peggy	Weil, Lori
Staab, C.	Tornillo, Cheryl	Weinberger, Maria
Staats, Beatrice	Trestor, Chris	Weis, Michael
Stack, Richard A.	Tricario, Joseph	Weldon, Eric
Stafform, Audre	Trifletti, Debbie	Welker, Don
Stanton, R.	Trimmer, Mark	Wengryn, Barbara
Starck, Deborah R.	Triovannis, Joanne	Wertz, Caitlin
Stassord, Delores	Trivedi, Malar	Westfall, Susan
Steeneck, Karen	Trujillo, James	Wherherim, Emmanuel
Stevens, Scott	Turner, Christina	Whisyed, Lee
Stewart, Kimberly	Ulrich, Andra	Wicklund, Barbara
Stine, Theresa	Vaccaro, Lou	Wiesner, Charmaine
Stirling, Keith	Valerzano, Michael	Willard, Thomas P.
Stock, Toni	VanAntwerp, Katherine	Williams, Bridget
Stoppas, Greg	Vanbier, Glenn	Williams, Carolyn
Stratton, Jeanette	Vanderwal, Dean	Wilson, Eleanor
Strez, Natalie	Vangeli, Debbie	Wisantora, Anthony
Stump, Kristina	VanHouten, Margaret	Wise, K.
Sullivan, Paul F.	Vanuitert, Deena	Wooley, Kristen
Surampadt, Prasad	Varettoni, Cindy	Worton, Kenneth
Surampudi, Aparna	Varia, Makesh	Wouters, John
Surdan, Debbie	Varoden, Jerome	Wowchuck, Carolyn
Szafroski, Alexander	Varzal, Diane	Wright, Dana
Taberno, Mary	Vendetti, Jann	Wright, Kimberly
Tagliareni, A.	Venis, Lisa	Wright, Sally
Tagliareni, Kathy	Ventura, Irene D.	Wurtzel, David C.
Tallman, Michele	Vias, Purvi	Yahi, Slim
Tanko, Mandi	Vicci, Cathy R.	Yi, Chia-Feng
Tarsey, M.A.	Vignola, Carmela	York, Cindy
Tauscher, John	Visnic, Steve	Young, Kathy
Taylor, Chris	Visnosky, Suzanne	Yuen, Joanne
Taylor, Margaret	Volpe, Michael	Yusiewicz, Jennifer
Tepper, Maryann	Vulih, Diane	Zagari, Marianne
Thickstun, Bill	Vulovic, Linda S.	Zaslow, Maxine
Thiella, Les	Wagner, Judy	Zedowski, Mark J.
Thomas, Dawn	Wallace, Joseph	Zimmerman, Rita
Thomas, Debra	Wallas, G. Kerry	Zinser, Glenn
Thomas, Farhe	Wang, Ching T.	Zito, Kimberly
Thomas, Marietta	Wang, Minnie	Zulinski, Sonia
Thomas, Mary	Ward, Athena	Zumoro, Carlos
Thomas, Nancy	Ward, John	Zuylowski, Margaret
Petition: Strong Opposition to Consolidated Mercury Storage at the New Haven, Depot—Adult Community Members (Comment Document No. 184A)		
Alexander, Tracy	Atchley Jr., David	Barrand, Roxanne D.
Amick, Brad	Bader, Daniel	Batdorf, Gwen
Aspy, Rose	Baker, Amanda	Beckman, Lisa

Table 2–2. Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign or Petition (Continued)

Petition: Strong Opposition to Consolidated Mercury Storage at the New Haven, Depot—Adult Community Members (Comment Document No. 184A) (continued)

Bedwell, John
Bedwell, Kevin
Bedwell, Karen
Behnampour, Shahrokh and Linda
Bell, Angela
Bitner, Nancy
Blair, Jill
Bradtmueller, Jim
Bradtmueller, Margene
Brueck, Lowell E.
Bure, Patricia
Burford, Keri
Butcher, Nancy
Butcher, Wanda
Cage, Chris
Cain, Jill N.
Campbell, Margaret E.
Cartwright, Tom
Claymiller, Ed
Comer, Fannie
Dabney, Beverly J.
David, Mogan
David, Suzanne
Davis, Devonna
Davis, Theodore A.
Dawson, Jacque J.
Dehucoway, Edward N.
Dennis, Elaine
Depew, C. Victor
Derickson, Laurel
Doenges, Douglas
Dornseif, Ellen
Dube, Joshua
Ely, Julie K.
Ferrier, Bryan
Franke, Thomas A.
Franz, Kent
Freimuth, Rita
Fulton, Pamela
Gepfert, Joyce
Gerardot, James
Gerbers, Stacie
Girardot, Donna
Gordon, JoAnna
Gray, Suzanne C.
Griebel, Jim
Gronau, Carolyn
Gustin, Cyrus
Hallfeldt, Alan A.
Harger, Linda
Hartman, Sandra
Hartman-Swart, Elizabeth
Hartwig, Steve
Hawthorne, Kathy
Hayes, Katherine
Henry, Bob
Hermann, M. Joan
Hevel, Nancy
Hodge, Vickie
Hoeppner, Martha A.
Howard, Barbara
Irvine, Wahna Louise
Johnston, Doug
Kaiser, Charlotte
Keen, Becky
Kill, Sheryl
Koeste, Virginia A.
Krauter, Lorena C.
Krauter, Dan F.
Krider, Harry D.
Kring, Don
Lash, Lawrence R.
Leondard, Linda
Libyss, Linda L.
Lomont, Ronald E.
Lomont, Greg
Losher, Lori B.
Love Jr., Jerry A.
Maggart, Jerry L.
Markley, Darwin C.
Martin, RoseAnn
Martin, Diane
Mason, Barbara
Mata, Janet
McAlexander, Wm. Dale
McEvoy, Janet K.
McIntosh, Dan and Geraldine
Melcher, Donnalyn
Merica, Larry G.
Mertz, Pat
Meyer, Penny
Meyer, Janet
MiClish, Kevin
Miller, Melanie
Moehring, Abby
Muldoon, Laura
Murphy, Sue
Myer, Nancy E.
Niemeyer, Jon K.
North, John W.
Panonl, Harry
Parker, Michelle
Patterson, Nakia
Pelueger, Steven M.
Pequignot, Michael
Pollard, Darlene
Ratliff, Alberta
Recker, Andy
Reeb, Phyllis
Richard, Susan
Ries Jr., Russell J.
Roberts, Laura
Robinson, Connie J.
Robinson, Ann
Rorick, R. Ann
Roth, Dorothy L.
Roth, Thomas A.
Roth, Dawn E.
Rothgeb, Mark A.
Roy, Shari
Rydell, Brenda
Sandoval, Victor
Sargent, Carl D.
Saylor, Gayleen
Scheumann, Kristin
Schoof, Carol S.
Schrader, Mendy
Seidel, Stacey
Shear, Sandy E.
Sholty, Vicki
Short, Karen
Smith, Mark A.
Smith-Causey, Jodi
Snyder, Robin
Spieth, Tina M.
Steffen, Patricia L.
Stemmler, Ruth
Stilwell, Shirley
Stopher, Julie
Stoppenhegen, Donald H.
Theisen, Allison
Thomas, Gloria D.
Tracy, Kathy
Trowbridge, Judith
Ummel, Sharon
Voelker, Linda R.
Vondran, Sheryll
Walker, Lilleai L.
Waymire, Mindy
Weber, Kevin
Weisenburger, Edward R.
Weisenburger, Judy
Westwater, Dewaine
Wheaton, Earl D.
Whittern, Deloris

Table 2–2. Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign or Petition (Continued)

Petition: Strong Opposition to Consolidated Mercury Storage at the New Haven, Depot—Adult Community Members (Comment Document No. 184A) (continued)		
Wickham, Elizabeth	Workman, Julie	Zachany, Lisa
Wietfeldt, Fred	Wurm, Victor J.	Zimmey, Jon
Wolfe, Nancy Ann	Wylie, Teddie	
Petition: Strong Opposition to Consolidated Mercury Storage at the New Haven, Depot—Future Leaders of the Community (Comment Document No. 184B)		
Abbott, Jacob S.	Bloxson, Zachary	Croy, David L.
Abbott, William M.	Boisvert, Tiffany	Cubias, Brian
Adam, Alicia	Bonde, Brandi	Culbertson, Gerri
Adamonis, Sara	Borton, Nina	Curneal, Andrea
Adams, Andrea	Bowser, Emily	Dager, Amanda
Adams, Ashley	Bradtmueller, Pam	Dager, Anthony
Adams, Joe	Braun, Danielle	Dager Jr., James L.
Adams, Julie	Britt, Brenda	Damentka, Lucy
Ahlersmeyer, Eileen E.	Brock, Erica	Dannaoue, Waseam
Akins, Simone	Brockhous, Connie S.	Danner, Amanda
Al-Esawi-Al-Ejalewe-Bowman, Carrie Ann	Brooks, Kara	David, Chad M.
	Browand, John	David, Erica
Al-Janabi, Carla	Browand, Sarah	Dawnan, Brian
Al-Janabi, Jeffrey	Brown, Antonio	Dawson, Thom
Allgeies, Travis	Brown, Mallory	Deininger, Darlene
Allgeler, Chrissy	Brown, Sarah	Delagvance, Janice
Ames, Josh	Brueggemann, Amy	Dent, Carolyn
Amstutz, Colton	Brueggemann, Mary	Desjordins, Dan
Amstutz, Joe	Bruick, Melissa	Deweese, Jenna
Baker, Robin	Bryan, Mary A.	Deyer, Chris
Ball, James M.	Buchmeier, Tim	Deyer, Sheryl
Ball, Josie	Buescher, Cassandra	Dolley, Derek
Ball, Schaelley	Burford, Trentyn	Domoni, Zal
Bangert, Jeremy	Burkart, Patrick	Douglas, Mallory
Barr, Eric	Burns, Ashley	Drummer, Marilyn
Barrett, Jason	Burse, Tamera	Dumford, Alex
Baughman, Donna	Butt, James	Dumford, Jessica
Baughman, Steve	Butt, Teresa	Dunn, Elaina
Beard, L.L.	Cartwright, Joe	Dyben, Brandon
Beasley, Jill	Chaffee, Brittainy	Dye, James
Becraft, Mike	Cheatham, Paige	Eakright, Jerod
Beemer, Shanna	Cheviron, David J.	Edwards, Derrick
Beker, Pete	Childers, Nathan	Egri, Devon
Bell, Jeromie	Childs, Brittany	Ehle, Brooke
Belvin, Cory	Chin, Ashley	Eichorn, Jenny
Bender, Ashlee	Christensen, Heidi	Ellison, Jeannie
Bennett, Tiffany	Christianer, Sharon	Ellsworth, Nathan
Bergman, Molly	Claypool, Laura	Ente, Alex
Berry, Carl	Clements, Barbara	Evans, Ashley
Berry, Jordan	Clost, Scott	Fackler, Amanda
Biddle, Allison	Cobb, Vicki	Farrell, Kelli
Bishop, Danielle M.	Compeau, Dan	Fendel, Jeramy
Blackmon, Norma L.	Compston, Nicole	Ferguson, Stacey
Blauvelt, Nicole	Cottrell, Amanda	Ferguson, William M.
Bloxson, Gregory	Craig, Andy	Fine, Neil
Bloxson, J.D.	Crone, Adam	Fink, Genesis
Bloxson, Sharon	Croy, Barbara	Fischman, Diane

Table 2–2. Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign or Petition (Continued)

Petition: Strong Opposition to Consolidated Mercury Storage at the New Haven, Depot—Future Leaders of the Community (Comment Document No. 184B) (continued)

Fisher, Colinda
Fisher, Stevie
Forbes, Amanda
Francher, Christy
Freeman, Ashley
Freeze, Kati
Friend, Kristin
Frohberg, Leslie A.
Fultz, J.A.
Gaddy, Adam
Gage, Bridget
Gallion, Danielle
Garman, Courtney
Gase, Lyndsay
Gibson, Chuck
Gibson, Lisa
Gillespie, Clinton
Gillespie, Logan
Goeglein, Kent
Goranson, Susan
Gordon, Chris
Gordon, Hydee
Gordon, Jonathon
Gordon, Karen R.
Gordon, Steven
Gottfried, Nick
Graddy, Nicholas
Grant, Chantelle
Grawcock, Kodi
Grayless, Chris
Greek, Eugene
Green, Heather
Greenman, Burdette
Greenman, Jason
Greenman, Karen
Gressley, Stephanie
Gruss, Lisa
Guptail, Julie
Guptail, Michael L.
Gustin Jr., Leroy L.
Habisch, Jason
Hagan, Serena
Hale, Sandy
Hanefeld, Linda
Hany, Ryan
Harshman, Katherine
Hauke, Ann E.
Heath, Michael
Hecht, Wendy
Hellerud, Nate
Henning, Samantha
Henry, Steve
Henry, Sue
Herman, Jessica
Hevel, Amanda
Hickey, Marissa
Higginbotham, Kendra
Higginbotham, Kristy
Higgins, Amanda
Hilker, Jessica
Hitzemann, Florence
Hockemeyer, Jane
Hockemeyer, Julaine
Holocher, Cheyenne
Holt, Emilee
Holycross, Matt
Hotchkiss, Gisela
Huffman, Amanda
Huffman, Sinda
Hughes, Amy
Hughes, Sean
Hunt, Judith A.
Inglese, Jennifer
Isenbarger, Chris
Jackson, David
Jacquay, Lisa
Janes, Matt
Janes, Stacie
Jehl, Jessica
Johnson, Amanda
Johnson, Dennis
Johnson, Paul D.
Johnson, Stephanie
Jones, Jessica
Jones, Lindsey
Jones, Sandy
Jones, Taryn
Justus, Jamie
Kart, Jill L.
Kaufman, Heidi
Kaufman, Sasha
Kaylor, Christina
Keen, Ryan
Keeny, Rusty
Keesler, Brandon
Kelley, Andy
Kelley, Scott
Kelly, Josiah
Kendall, Molly
Kennedy, Jeff
Kerbel, William
Kersjes, Sharon
Kiesel, Heather
Kinney, Alysha
Kinney, Derick
Kinney, Greg
Kline, Amy
Korepanova, Anna
Kramer, Emily
Kraner, Kelly
Kreier, Kay G.
Kreier, Walter
Kreis, Nicole
Kreisher, Dennis
Kreisher, Joyce A.
Ladig, Dan
Lake, Danielle
Lambert, Amanda
Light, Ashlee
Lineberry, Diane
Lineberry, Jim
Linehan, Robin
Linker, Teresa
Logan, Meredith
Lothamer, Lance
Lough, Bobby
Love, Dennis
Love, Karen
Lowe, Blake
Lytle, Brian
Lytle, Crystal
Lytle, Kyle
Mackin, Jeff
Maiden, Brandon
Mansfeld, Whitney
Marhenke, Meghan
Markley, Erica L.
Marshall II, Virgil
Martin, Alecia
Mason, Brittany
Mathieu, Paul
McCartney, Kevin
McCracken, Karen D.
McDonald, Caitlin
McDonald, Terry E.
McDowell, Brent
McDulade, John
McEvoy, Chrystal
McGuire, Larry
McHenry, Jonah
McIntosh, David M.
McKale, Megan
McKale, Whitney
McKenzie, Veronica
McKinley, Alex
Meadows, Brandon

Table 2–2. Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign or Petition (Continued)

Petition: Strong Opposition to Consolidated Mercury Storage at the New Haven, Depot—Future Leaders of the Community (Comment Document No. 184B) (continued)

Menshy, Cheri
Messick, Amber
Meyer, Judith D.
Michael, Tom
Miller, Holly
Miller, Krystal
Miller, Kyra
Miller, Rachel A.
Mills, Bud
Miner, Keith
Minick, Char
Minick, Jennifer
Minick, Ken
Mix, Cherlyn
Mock, Leesa
Moeller, Danielle
Monday, Sebrina
Monroe, Gloria
Monter, Mariana
Monter, Perla
Morimanno, Kayla
Morton, Kate
Mowan, Kimberly
Muldoon, Joe
Murphy, Leah
Murphy, Natasha
Murphy, Sarah
Murphy, Sherri
Myers, Michelle
Nealy, Josh
Nelson, Andrew
Neuhaus, Heather
Neumann, Linda S.
Newswanger, Ben
Nichols, Amber
Nichter, Chad
Nichter, Judith
Norton, Marjorie R.
Nottage, Gabrielle
Ort, Betty
Osmanovic, Elvisa
Osterman, Tim
Painter, Jenna M.
Panyand, Penny
Parker, David
Parris, Brandy
Parrish, Jerad
Partribe, Danner
Patnoude, Robbi
Patton, Ryan
Patty, Rose
Payne, Jered
Pease, Jenny
Pelz, Dan and Kim
Pemberton, Crista
Pemberton, Christy
Pemberton, Emily
Pemberton, Ted
Peterson, Nancy
Phifer, Tamica M.
Phifer, Thomas
Pishvai, Tony
Platt, Kyle
Poiry, Stephan M.
Police, Joseph
Prather, Kevin
Preston, Ashley
Pucher, Daniel
Pucher, Melody
Puckett, Derick
Puckett, Jessica
Purvis, Heather
Purvis, Mary Jo
Purvis, Tabatha
Quandt, Haley
Ramirez, Jessica
Ramsey, Allexa
Rauch, Abby
Reed, Jenna
Reichhart, Melissa
Reif, Keli B.
Rider, Amanda
Rife, Erika
Rikard, Ashley
Ritchie, Phillip
Rivera, Eric
Robinson, Mike
Romary, Adrienne
Rondot, Amanda
Roper, Jacquelyn
Rumsahag, Matt
Rupp, Jo
Saalfrank, Ann
Sampson, Casey
Samra-Theurer, Ann
Santana, Yanci
Sarrazin, Jamie
Sauer, Alexandra
Saylor, Josh
Schaadt, Lois M.
Schafer, Cheryl
Schaffer, Aaron
Scherer, Amber
Scherschel, Sue
Schimes, Krystal
Schimmel Jr., Fred W.
Schimmel, Ruth Ann
Schoenle, Jennifer
Schortgen, Adam
Schumm, Imogene
Schwartz, Emanuel C.
Scott, Deborah
Scott, Donald
Secrist, Staci
Sent, Teresa
Shaffer, Nick
Shanebrook, Jenny
Shelpman, Natasha
Shoemaker, Jonathon
Showman, Jeff
Showman, Matthew
Showman, Megan
Showman, Mitchel
Showman, Morgan
Showman, Tracy
Shumaker, Kirstie
Silvers, Kristin
Sinacola, Jane
Slusher, Brandon
Slusher, Justin
Smith, Aimee
Smith, Angie
Smith, Erin
Smith, Jesse
Smuts, Brittany
Snyder, Austin
Sowles, Aaron
Spurr, Michelle
Starewich, Andee
Stark, Christina L.
Stauffer, Jonathon
Steckley, Alice
Steinman, Eric
Stenley, Matt
Stephanites, Amanda
Stephens, Jerry W.
Stephens, Marjorie M.
Stevens, Heather
Stevenson, Charity
Stoffer, Nate
Stotler, Megan
Stroh, Sam
Strong, Chris
Swygart, Ben
Syster, Liz
Tevis, Dot

Table 2–2. Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign or Petition (Continued)

Petition: Strong Opposition to Consolidated Mercury Storage at the New Haven, Depot—Future Leaders of the Community (Comment Document No. 184B) (continued)		
Tews, Ralph G.	Umphrey, Scott	Williams, Brittney
Theetge, Nicole	Varner, Ellen	Wilsford, Ember
Theurer, Mallorie	Vaughn, Trevor	Wilson, Abigail
Thomas, Chad	Vazquez, Erik	Wilson, Carrie
Thompson, Eric	Walda, Joyce	Winger, Allison
Thorpe, Ashley	Waldon, Robert W.	Winget, Chris
Tibbot, Thomas R.	Walsh, Tabatha	Wissman, Barbara
Tompkins, Mandy	Walz, Rick	Wissman, Steven K.
Tompkins, Maranda L.	Watkins, Jessica	Woods, Jennifer
Tompkins, Mauriah	Weimer, Alan	Workman, Mary
Tracey, Violet E.	Welsh, Jennifer	Wright, Megan
Trevino, Sarah	Wesner, JoAnn	Wyrick, John M.
Trout, Amanda	Wesner, Wm. J.	Wyrick, Shawna
Trzynka, Julie	White, Ann	Yoder, Rachel
Trzynka, Michelle	Whitehurst, Nic	Youngblutt, Jasmine
Turk, Brian	Whitesell, Nicole	Zent, Tyler
Turk, Tommy	Wiesehan, Linda	Zoller, Jenny
Tuttle, Meagan	Wilder, Pam	

2.2 COMMENT DOCUMENTS

This section presents the written comment documents received by DNSC on the *Draft Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement* (MM EIS) from email, fax, U.S. mail, and the Web site; oral comments recorded and transcribed from voice mail; and oral comments recorded and transcribed from the public meetings.

The comment documents are presented in order by identification number. Documents with identical content are presented once. Individual comments within a comment document are denoted by a vertical line in the margin and an issue category code that corresponds to the responses presented in Section 2.3.

Commentor No. 1: Dorothy Shifley

302 Tweedwood Drive
New Haven IN 46774
May 21, 2003

Attention: Project Manager
MM EIS, DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

As a resident of New Haven, Indiana, I attended the information and comment-gathering meeting on May 20, 2003. The meeting was very well conducted. Your display booths and personnel were helpful, and the public was given every chance to express an opinion.

These are my thoughts on this subject:

1. To bring in more mercury to New Haven is very bad for business. It makes it difficult to sell our town as a good place to build housing additions and companies. SE-2
2. More mercury would virtually kill growth on the east side of the city.
3. New Haven is more highly populated than the proposed storage locations in Utah and Nevada. Those states would be happy to have more mercury, while we in New Haven would not. AC-1
4. The security at Casad Depot where the mercury is now stored is very poor. In addition, we have frequent tornado warnings, not to mention the devastating storms that have touched down here. RA-1
5. If indeed it is necessary to maintain stockpiles of mercury for use in times of national emergency, why would you move it all to one place where it could be destroyed in one natural or terrorist event. Keep it where it is. AN-1

Sincerely yours,

Dorothy Shifley

Dorothy Shifley

cc: Honorable Mark Souder
Honorable Mike Pence
Honorable Richard Lugar
Honorable Evan Bayh

Commentor No. 2: James D. Webster

July 30, 2003

Project Manager
Mercury Management EIS
DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Ste. 3229
Ft. Belvoir, Va. 22060-6223

Re: Draft Mercury Management EIS

Dear Sir,

As a resident of Salt Lake City and landowner of property in Tooele City, I strenuously oppose the proposed storage of excess mercury at the former Tooele Army Depot. With respect to my background and knowledge of problems associated with the handling and storage of mercury, I hold post-graduate degrees in land and environmental planning from Harvard University, taught courses in environmental planning at Utah State University (USU) prior to initiating my own consulting practice in 1973, and have been directly involved with environmental and reclamation issues of the mining industry for 30 years. I currently sit on the Advisory Board for the USU Department of Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning.

With respect to first-hand experience, a primary area of my professional emphasis has been mine feasibility analysis with respect to environmental impacts, management of on-going mine exploration/production, oversight of ore processing, and reclamation design for mined lands and abandoned processing facilities. I'm aware of contaminated sites throughout the Inter-mountain region and have worked with numerous communities in mitigating the negative environmental consequences of mercury contamination. Projects with which I am most familiar include the former processing facilities at Park City, Keetley, Bauer, and Mercur, Utah; Goldcreek, Sheridan and Anaconda, Montana; and Seven Troughs and Mardis, Nevada. As an expert witness, I've testified regarding the long-term negative consequences of mined ore processing and limitations to community development as a result of mercury and related contamination. I have authored and/or co-authored seven environmental assessments and five draft final statements dealing with community development as may be impacted by mine processing. With respect to the Tooele area, I authored the "Development Master Plan for Saltair Beach, Great Salt Lake State Park and the EIS for Stansbury Park new town, adjacent to Tooele City. I also master planned the new community of Overlake in Tooele City.

In 1996-97, I was retained by Endeavor to prepare the master plan for the Tooele Army Depot, the very location of the proposed storage. This plan for privatization in no manner whatsoever contemplated, or made any provisions whatsoever for the transport, handling or storage of mercury. Indeed, the opposite was true. The basis for the privatization effort was to contradict and eradicate the long-standing negative image of this military facility as may be associated with LU-2

Commentor No. 2: James D. Webster (continued)

July 30, 2003; page two

hazardous materials. The primary goal of the master plan was to avoid any and all sorts of association with deleterious materials such as mercury, and to specifically focus on clean economic enterprises that prohibit the use of hazardous and toxic materials as processing agents. Certainly, the importation of mercury for storage would have been considered completely reprehensible and absolutely contrary to the intent of the master plan. The proposal to import "excess mercury" is in direct opposition to the scope of services I was expected to address, according to the goals and objectives of Tooele City and Tooele County community leaders and community residents. **LU-2 (cont'd.)**

Given all of the above and my first hand involvement with a wide variety of issues in Tooele County, including incinerator emissions, the proposal for spent nuclear fuel rod storage on the Goshute Reservation, and Envirocare's effort to obtain permits for Class B and C nuclear waste, it is very unsettling that I've not heard about this matter of excess mercury storage. For whatever reason(s), it would appear that the Defense National Stockpile Center has been almost entirely ineffective in involving and informing the general public of this proposal and any related comment opportunity. I became aware only recently, through an article in *The Salt Lake Tribune*.

I was in Tooele County offices yesterday and asked Ray Johnson, P.E., the County Engineer if he knew how one might obtain pertinent information and comment on the proposal. He didn't know anything about the process and was unaware of a public hearing two days later, of which I learned from the local newspaper. I then asked the County Recorder, and received the same answer. A staff reporter for *The Transcript-Bulletin* finally offered some sketchy information, and his awareness of the comment period was uncertain. I don't know whatever guidelines to which you may subscribe as regards notifying the public, but it seems clear that you would hope to bring mercury to Utah under the cover of darkness. **PP-1**

While one may expect that the average citizen of Tooele County and the Wasatch Front may not be fully conversant with the downside of an promotional pitch to store mercury, notwithstanding whatever economic benefits may be promoted by federal spin doctors, I can assure you that I recognize the inherent downside of this proposal from a wide spectrum of vantage points, including long-term costs of medical related impacts to residents of Utah, degradation of natural systems and the general environment, economic consequences due to national and international perceptions of Tooele as a hazardous waste dump, and an absolute insult to anyone's intelligence upon inevitable enlightenment of the facts of this matter that the proponents would even contemplate the rubric presumption on placing our lives and the lives of our progeny at such intolerable and unreasonable risk. **AC-1 SE-1 SE-2**

I have perused the minimal amount of information available and find serious deficiencies with respect to the proximity of the proposed storage site to urban habitation, security is not adequately addressed, numerous inaccuracies are reported as regards security, safety precautions for shipment and management of shipment are not realistic, emergency management is inadequate, socio-economic impacts are not addressed relative to other alternatives, precaution against environmental contamination is insufficient, and a plan for closure of the facility hasnot **NP-1**

Commentor No. 2: James D. Webster (continued)

July 30, 2003; page three

been addressed in a realistic manner. In short, the matter of storing excess mercury has not been properly evaluated, either according to the NEPA guidelines, or common sense. NP-1 (cont'd.)

Regardless of however well intentioned the efforts of containment may have been, and regardless of whatever state of the art technology as may be available, the unavoidable consequences of transporting and handling mercury pose an unacceptable level of risk for present and future generations. I oppose this proposal and will do everything within my capability to announce such risks in whatever public forum may be available. I will not knowingly allow victimization of the economic and environmental welfare of the Tooele Valley community and will strive to make all citizens of the Wasatch Front and Utah aware of the downside of this ill advised proposal. It is completely unacceptable, untenable, and reprehensible. AC-1

I can assure you that if this seemingly covert, sham public process is indeed your intention, that if mercury contaminates Utah without full disclosure to the public as has thus far been the case, this will become yet another national disgrace and poster child of disingenuous, furtive manipulation of the NEPA by the Bush administration. You can be assured that once the general public realizes what has been done, there will be a repulsion and a concerted effort to investigate the process, or in this instance, non-process. Your approach to "management" of one of the planet's most dangerous materials has been evidenced thus far to be entirely unacceptable. Your election to ignore the spirit and intent of the NEPA is obvious, and that oversight may amount to so much cute politics in the current administration. What is not so cute, even contemptible is the Defense National Stockpile Center's willingness to accept and therefore foster an unabated risk to public health and welfare, to which the NEPA, the United States Constitution, and fair minded citizens of Tooele County and the Wasatch Front are otherwise committed.

I oppose the proposal.

Sincerely,

James D. Webster
Environmental Planning Consultant
938 Military Drive, Salt Lake City, Ut. 84108
(801) 583-6746

cc: Sen. Robert Bennett
Rep. James Matheson

Commentor No. 3: Steve Loeschner

From the MM EIS Web site–

How much are we talking about here? "The chlorine industry, which historically used large amounts of mercury in the production of chlorine before gradually phasing out its use, has supported efforts to convince the government to take title of its supplies. The industry has proposed donating its supplies to the government – thereby keeping it off global markets – in exchange for liability relief." See S.616

PN-2
PO-2

Commentor No. 4: Madonna Harrington Meyer

From the MM EIS Web site–

I understand that you are thinking of storing tons of mercury in [upstate] New York. You cannot do this. Do not transport the mercury to Seneca Lake. Do not store it there either. The Finger Lakes are a precious natural resource and they must be preserved. Even trace amounts of mercury are dangerous to humans and other living organisms.

AC-3

Commentor No. 5: Louis L. Lobdell

From the MM EIS Web site–

I live in Seneca Falls, New York and do a lot of fishing for food and sport and I don't want a mercury storage are anywhere near our beautiful Finger Lakes for the fear of a leak that could cause our lakes to be contaminated with mercury poisoning. New York already has Onondaga Lake, which is one of the most contaminated [contaminated] lakes in the country and we don't need another one. Due to the continual closing of factories in and around upstate New York we are losing a lot of the resources we had to attract moneys [monies] into our area. Our lakes and the fishing they provide are about all we really have left. Please don't store your mercury in New York State. Sincerely yours, Louie Lobdell.

AC-3

Commentor No. 6: Utah Department of Environmental Quality Connie Rauen

From the MM EIS Web site–

I am interested in learning more about the environmental inspection and monitoring requirements for the stored mercury. What environmental monitoring will be necessary and who will conduct the monitoring. Who will provide money for the monitoring/who will conduct the monitoring. Is the document "Environmental Inspection Plan for Mercury in Storage" available electronically?

SB-1

Commentor No. 7: Captain Curtiss C. King

May 22, 2003

Mercury Stockpile Meeting

1. How many mining companies are actually mining Mercury? (World) — PN-2
2. What are your plans for the Mercury? — AP-1
3. When was your last spill of Mercury at this facility or any other facility? — SB-3
4. Is the Mercury being over packed prior to transportation? — RT-1
5. Are all of the facilities using the same packaging technique? — RT-1
6. Is Mercury currently being produced in the United States? — PN-2
7. Can we submit a resolution to the United Nations to stop production in other countries until ours is depleted? — PN-3
8. Can the Mercury be converted back to its ore form? — AE-2
9. Why is it necessary to store in one place? — AP-1
10. What kind of economic gain will this community have by storing this commodity? — SE-1
11. What level are your on site responders at and who responds if it is beyond their capabilities? — ER-1
12. Will their be funding available for Haz Mat training to other agencies that may be called to respond? — ER-1
13. The Warren City Fire Department will respond to any Haz Mat spill but who will actually dispose of the product? — ER-1
14.

Capt Curtiss C King
111 South St
Warren Ohio 44483

Commentor No. 8: Marian Nelson

From the MM EIS Web site–

If all the mercury is "safely stored" at various sites - why not just leave it there? At the rate things are happening now, our part of Utah is shaping up to be a prime target for terrorists or a natural disaster. Let's not make it worse. marian nelson

AC-1

Commentor No. 9: Bob Nelson

First off thank you for last night's forum, I thought it was done well. My name is Bob Nelson and I live and own an advertising agency in New Haven. Like everyone else at the meeting I would just as well not have any more mercury stored in New Haven. We have paid our dues with the nasty landfill fight. Please take a look at the pure fact of the number of people effected versus a site out west. I also thought the "act of God" fear is a major concern, we do have many tornados in this part of the mid-west and it's only a matter of time before one comes near. I went to high school (Woodlan High School) only 5 miles from the site and remember a tornado back in the late 70's that went right past the depot. Even then we were concerned about the effect of a natural disaster. Finally as a tax payer I am concerned about the additional cost to move it out west, but lets face it when, if ever, has Washington worried about spending money, it's only 30 million dollars we buy toilets for the space shuttle that cost more than that!
Please no more mercury in New Haven

Thank you for the opportunity to speak my peace.

God Bless America,
Bob Nelson
9150 Sea View Ct.
New Haven, Indiana
rnelson821@aol.com

AC-1
RA-1
RA-3
CB-1

Commentor No. 10: Douglas Knowlton

Go for it! Let's get all those little puddles of federal surplus mercury consolidataed into one big pool. You know the statistics better than I. Mercury is getting into places it shouldn't be. It is harming people, especially children. One might argue that mercury poisoning is one way of controlling the exploding population of humans on earth. It's not very effective, however. Just makes more people ill and creates a drain on medical and economic resources. So, let's gather and guard the mercury. There are much more effective ways to control population.

Sincerely,

Douglas Knowlton

TheDouglas@ameritech.net

AC-1

Commentor No. 11: Chantelle E. Harris

From the MM EIS Web site–

To whom it may concern: I have recently learned of the government's desire to store the mercury at the Tooele Army Depot. I am strongly opposed to this for several reasons. We bought our home here in Tooele less than a month ago. We are located about 1 mile from the army depot. We purchased out here because it is a good safe place to raise a family. We feel that our children will have more freedom and safety here than elsewhere. If mercury is stored near our home our children will be robbed of that freedom and safety. This will seriously affect our community! There are millions of acres of uninhabited space in this country where hazardous materials can be stored. One mile from my new home should NOT be one of them. The storage of these chemicals will also drive down property values and reduce the ability to re-sale which could drive up the already high foreclosure rates in this area. Mercury should be stored in a remote area where there are no residences for 100 miles not in our backyard. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Chantelle E. Harris

AC-1

SE-2

AC-1

Commentor No. 12: Barbra Luce-Turner

Please choose the best option for future generations--store mercury in one consolidated place for the next forty years. This will have a positive impact on the health of pregnant women and on the health of my grandchildren and future great-grandchildren.
Thank you.

Barbra Luce-Turner
200 S. Marshall #6
Harrisburg IL 62946

TO GENEROUS SOULS EVERY TASK IS NOBLE--EURIPIDES

AC-1

Commentor No. 13: Jim and Lynn Shaw

From the MM EIS Web site–

We are against the storage of mercury in Tooele County in the state of Utah. I am tired of this beautiful valley being used as a dumping ground for hazardous materials. I do not feel that our elected officials speak for us in this matter if they are for the storage. I feel that there is a lot of greed in this county to allow the storage of these hazardous materials, they are only in it for the money and do not care about the families that live here. We moved into this valley 3 years ago and 6 months later learned that it was the number 1 polluted county in the entire United States. We having be hoping that the news would settle down so that we can sell our house and move out of this polluted area but unfortunately the county keeps trying to bring this waste into our backyards. PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS POLLUTION TO BE BROUGHT INTO MY BACKYARD, THINK OF MY CHILDREN AND OTHERS WHEN YOU MAKE THIS DECISION. I ASK YOU WOULD YOU WANT THIS IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD??? AND IF SO WHY ARE YOU NOT TRYING TO BID ON THE STORAGE???? PLEASE GIVE ME AN ANSWER TO MY LAST TWO QUESTIONS. THANK YOU, JIM AND LYNN SHAW

AC-1

AE-1

Commentor No. 14: R.G.W. Fort Wayne

From the MM EIS Web site–

From Ft Wayne Indiana / Why do we have so much mercury, and what do we intend to do with it, or what is it used for? Thank you RGW Fort Wayne **PN-2**

Commentor No. 15: James F. Shearer

From the MM EIS Web site–

We simply have to get over this "not in my backyard" syndrome. The Mercury isn't going to magically go away. I support using current storage plans, as long as transportation of the Mercury is kept to an absolute minimum, and shipped to the depot CLOSEST to its present location. This reasonable restriction is necessary to prevent either an accidental mishap, or a terrorist act. **AC-1** **RT-1**

Commentor No. 16: Kevin

From the MM EIS Web site–

Please don't bring any more toxic waste into Utah. Even if Tooele wants it, the rest of Utah has to live with it. And we don't want it. **AC-1** **WM-1**

Commentor No. 17: Cristen Walker

From the MM EIS Web site–

As a resident of Tooele county I find it appalling that my town would be considered as a storage site for large amounts of mercury. Mercury is a well known toxin that can cause many health concerns including decreased quality of life, premature death and severe birth defects. Even knowing all of the danger it possesses, the DNSC and local government officials claim with a straight face that storing mercury in Tooele poses no threat to the local residents. If a large storage site is needed, find one away from an area of human population. Not one that is near families, livestock and densely populated areas. Provide this new area with a high level of security and treat mercury as you would any other highly toxic chemical. **AC-1** **SB-1**

Commentor No. 18: Barbara McKnight

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Please do not store excess mercury in Romulus, New York. **AC-3**

Commentor No. 19: Neil Chaffie

Project Manager
MercuryManagement EIS
DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060

Gentlemen:

With regard to the possible storage of mercury at the former Seneca Army Depot in Romulus, N.Y., would it not make more sense to place this material in the empty bunkers (igloos) at Seneca instead of suggesting the use of warehouses? There are 511 of these bunkers and I think all are empty at this time. There would be no need to fear fire, earthquake or what have you. In warehouses, built in the early 1940s, one would have to be concerned with the possibility of an accident, fire or an act of nature such as an earthquake, tornado or such. AC-3

Neil Chaffie
PO Box 543
Ovid, NY 14521-0543
(607) 869-5049
e-mail chaffie@fltg.net

Commentor No. 20: Diane Gorgy

From the MM EIS Web site–

I am a resident of Hillsborough, NJ. I am extremely concerned about the storage of the mercury at the depot on Roycefield Road. All of the residents in the adjoining areas have well water. WR-1 The possibility of contamination of the well water is definitely a concern. Hillsborough has a large population. Storage a toxic substance in such a large quantity in this community is inappropriate. AC-1 If an emergency situation arises where mercury is volatilized, the number of resident affected would be great. Please consider moving the mercury storage to a site that is less populated.

Commentor No. 21: Nancy Sullivan

May 21, 2003

Project Manager
Mercury Management EIS
DNSC-E Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road (Suite 3229)
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

RE: Mercury Management EIS

I was very pleased to see the recent draft environmental impact statement recommending long-term, consolidated storage of the nearly 5,000 metric tons of federal surplus mercury. This seems to be a far preferable solution than selling it or leaving it in its current multiple-storage locations.

I urge the adoption of the long-term storage proposal.

I think selling any of the stockpile is a really bad solution. Already, too much mercury waste and emissions have been released into the environment, poisoning air and water, ending up in fish and other wildlife, and eventually poisoning us and our children. AC-1

I also believe leaving the mercury in its current multiple locations is not the best way to safeguard it; a single location is simpler and poses less hazards.

Right now there are four infants on my one-block street in Kentucky. Recent surveys indicate that 5 million women of childbearing age had levels of mercury in their blood that would put unborn children at risk of mercury-related health problems. This is reason enough to want to see the consolidated, long-term storage of this dangerous element rather than its sale or release.

Sincerely,

Nancy Sullivan
41 Bluegrass Ave.
Ft. Thomas, KY 41075

Commentor No. 22: HQ JMC – G4 Munitions Base Management Directorate Jay Lundberg

I represent the parent command to Hawthorne Army Depot. I have reviewed the
Draft EIS for Mercury Management, and have no problem with it. **NP-4**

Jay Lundberg
HQ JMC - G4 Munitions Base Mgt Directorate
GOGO Division
AMSJM-MBG
DSN 793-2318 Com. (309)782-2318

Commentor No. 23: John McGuire

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Stated that it would be reckless to consider mercury storage between two metropolitan areas in New York. **AC-3**

Commentor No. 24: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

(Note: 4 minute message – comment below is highly paraphrased): Responding to a recent "article" in which an area of central NY has been identified as a possible storage site for excess mercury. Caller currently suffering from disease she believes is caused by mercury amalgam fillings. Believes many diseases have a mercury-based component. States that "you guys are 'freaking nuts' to consider storage in NY because it will eventually leak into groundwater." **AC-3**

Commentor No. 25: Virginia Department of Environmental Quality Charles Ellis

Ladies/Gentlemen:

We have obtained your April 11, 2003 Federal Register notice (pages 17786-7, hereinafter "the Notice") concerning the Mercury Management EIS. This Office is responsible for coordinating Virginia's review of federal NEPA documents. In determining which state and local agencies should be involved in the review of the EIS, we need to know answers to some questions that are not reflected on your web site's "Frequently asked questions" heading.

It would appear, from the Notice, that the preferred alternative is to consolidate the quantities of mercury at one of the four sites (New Haven, Indiana; Warren, Ohio; Oak Ridge, Tennessee; or Hillsborough, New Jersey), or, as you say, at one of three other candidate locations (Notice, page 17786, right column). Assuming truck or train transit and reasonably direct routes, the mercury shipments would only affect Virginia if there are shipments between Oak Ridge, Tennessee and Hillsborough, New Jersey. Thus our questions:

(1) Has DLA decided which of the four sites would become the repository for the mercury?

(2) If not, has DLA decided upon another candidate location (outside of the four named in the Notice), or focused on one?

(3) If there is focus, or decision, on another candidate location:

(a) Is the site in Virginia? If so, does it exist or is it to be constructed? **AP-1**

(b) Is it situated so that shipments from any of the four places would go through Virginia to get to it?

Answers to these questions will help us decide whether we need to review the EIS and, if so, which Virginia agencies and localities should be involved in the review.

If you wish to discuss the matter, please feel free to call me at (804) 698-4488. Thanks very much.

Charles Ellis
Office of Environmental Impact Review
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
629 East Main Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

e-mail: chellis@deq.state.va.us
phone: as above

Commentor No. 26: Ohio Historic Preservation Office
Julie Quinlan

Ohio Historic Preservation Office

567 East Hudson Street
Columbus, Ohio 43211-1030
614/ 298-2000 Fax: 614/ 298-2037

Visit us at www.ohiohistory.org/resource/histpres/

OHIO HISTORICAL SOCIETY
SINCE 1885

May 12, 2003

Attn: Dennis Lynch
Mercury Management EIS, DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Dear Mr. Lynch:

This is in response to the submission of a draft environmental impact statement concerning stockpiled mercury. Our comments are submitted in accordance with the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (36 CFR 800).

As indicated in the draft EIS, previous cultural resource studies of the Warren Depot in Trumbull County, Ohio have determined that no historic properties are located on the facility. We concur that if the Warren Depot is selected to store the material no historic properties will be affected. No further coordination is required unless the scope of the work changes or historic properties are discovered during the course of the work. In such a situation, this office should be contacted as per 36 CFR 800.13. CR-1

If you have any questions please contact me at 298-2043 (or through e-mail at jquinlan@ohiohistory.org).

Sincerely,

Julie Quinlan, Program Reviews Manager
Resource Protection and Review

serno: 995935

Commentor No. 27: United States Environmental Protection Agency Anne Norton Miller

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

MAY 28 2003

OFFICE OF
ENFORCEMENT AND
COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE

Project Manager
Mercury Management EIS
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John F. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

CEQ#030156 ERP#DOD-A0983200

Dear Sir or Madam:

EPA has reviewed the Mercury Management Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) concerning the long-term management of the Defense National Stockpile Center (DNSC) excess elemental mercury. Our review was conducted in accordance with our responsibilities under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and the Council on Environmental Quality regulations for implementing NEPA.

After reviewing the DEIS, EPA has not identified any significant environmental concerns related to DNSC's preferred alternative, which is to consolidate mercury storage at one site. In our opinion, the DEIS provides adequate documentation and provides suitable analysis upon which to base a decision. Accordingly, we have assigned a rating of **LO (Lack of Objections)** to the proposed action (see enclosed rating sheet). NP-2

We appreciate DNSC involving EPA early in the DEIS process, including us on workgroups and inviting us as a cooperating agency. DNSC's team communicated effectively with the various offices within EPA and constructively addressed EPA issues and comments during the development of the DEIS.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please feel free to contact me at (202) 564-5400 or Marguerite Duffy at (202) 564-7148.

Sincerely,

Anne Norton Miller
Director
Office of Federal Activities

Enclosure

Comment No. 28: Tennessee Historical Commission Herbert L. Harper

TENNESSEE HISTORICAL COMMISSION
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION
2941 LEBANON ROAD
NASHVILLE, TN 37243-0442
(615) 532-1550

April 15, 2003

Mr. Cornel A. Holder
Defense Logistics Agency
8725 Kingman Road/3229
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia, 22060-6223

RE: DOD, ORR/ELEMENTAL MERCURY MANAGEMENT, OAK RIDGE, ANDERSON COUNTY

Dear Mr. Holder:

In response to your request, received on Monday, April 7, 2003, we have reviewed the documents you submitted regarding your proposed undertaking. Our review of and comment on your proposed undertaking are among the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. This Act requires federal agencies or applicant for federal assistance to consult with the appropriate State Historic Preservation Office before they carry out their proposed undertakings. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has codified procedures for carrying out Section 106 review in 36 CFR 800. You may wish to familiarize yourself with these procedures (Federal Register, December 12, 2000, pages 77698-77739) if you are unsure about the Section 106 process.

Considering available information, we find that the project as currently proposed will NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT ANY PROPERTY THAT IS ELIGIBLE FOR LISTING IN THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES. Therefore, this office has no objection to the implementation of this project. Please direct questions and comments to Joe Garrison (615) 532-1550-103. You may find additional information concerning the Section 106 process and the Tennessee SHPO's documentation requirements at www.state.tn.us/environment/hist/sect106.htm. We appreciate your cooperation. CR-4

Sincerely

Herbert L. Harper
Executive Director and
Deputy State Historic
Preservation Officer

HLH/jyg

Commentor No. 29: Nevada Department of Cultural Affairs Alice M. Baldrica

STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS
Nevada State Historic Preservation Office
100 N. Stewart Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701

KENNY C. GUINN
Governor

SCOTT K. SISCO
Interim Director

April 14, 2003

RONALD M. JAMES
State Historic Preservation Officer

Mr. Dennis Lynch
Mercury Management EIS, DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
7825 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Re: Draft Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement—Hawthorne Army Depot Alternative

Dear Mr. Lynch:

The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has reviewed the above-referenced Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared by the Defense Logistics Agency (Department of Defense) regarding three alternatives for management of excess elemental mercury currently stored at four locations in the United States. One of these alternatives involves storage in 20 existing warehouses in the Group 102 area or in 125 igloos in the Group 5 area of the Hawthorne Army Depot, Hawthorne, Mineral County, Nevada.

The EIS acknowledges that the subject buildings at Hawthorne Army Depot have previously been determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, and that archaeological surveys suggest a low probability of prehistoric subsurface finds in the proposed project area. Further, the EIS states that no impacts are anticipated with this action "as any modifications to the warehouse would be internal and onsite property would not be disturbed."

Should the Hawthorne Army Depot alternative be selected, and once the specific details of the project are established, the SHPO would expect formal consultation be initiated in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, following regulations at 36CFR 800, *et. seq*. CR-3

If you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please contact Mella Harmon, historic preservation specialist, 775-684-3447.

Sincerely,

Alice M Baldrica

Alice M. Baldrica, Deputy
State Historic Preservation Officer

AMB/mrh

cc: Jewell Benscoter, Environmental Assistant, Hawthorne Army Depot

NSPO 04/02

Commentor No. 30: Virginia Department of Environmental Quality Ellie L. Irons

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

W. Tayloe Murphy, Jr.
Secretary of Natural Resources

Street address: 629 East Main Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219
Mailing address: P.O. Box 10009, Richmond, Virginia 23240
Fax (804) 698-4500 TDD (804) 698-4021
www.deq.state.va.us

Robert G. Burnley
Director

(804) 698-4000
1-800-592-5482

May 7, 2003

Mr. Dennis Lynch
Project Manager
Mercury Management EIS
DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060

RE: Draft Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement (DEQ-03-084F)

Dear Mr. Lynch:

Virginia's Department of Environmental Quality has reviewed the above document (hereinafter "Draft EIS"). Our comments follow.

The Department of Environmental Quality is responsible for coordinating Virginia's review of federal environmental documents and responding to appropriate federal officials on behalf of the Commonwealth. In this case, we did not coordinate the review with other Virginia agencies and localities because it is highly uncertain, except as noted herein, whether the Commonwealth would experience any environmental impacts from either of the two action alternatives (Draft EIS, page ES-1).

Project Description

The Defense Logistics Agency ("DLA") has published the Draft EIS in order to consider ways to manage the Defense Department's inventory of elemental mercury over the long term, since it is no longer needed for national defense (Draft EIS, page 1-1). The Draft EIS considers three alternatives:

Alternative 1, no action (Draft EIS, page 1-1). Under this alternative, DLA would continue to store mercury at four locations around the United States:

Commentor No. 30: Virginia Department of Environmental Quality Ellie L. Irons (continued)

Mr. Dennis Lynch
Page 2

New Haven, Indiana
Somerville, New Jersey
Warren, Ohio; and
Oak Ridge, Tennessee, where the U.S. Department of Energy operates a National Security Complex.

Alternative 2, consolidated storage at one of six sites (Draft EIS, pages 2-9 and 2-10; see Figure 1, page 1-2 for a map depicting the locations):

New Haven, Indiana
Somerville, New Jersey
Warren, Ohio
Hawthorne, Nevada
Romulus, New York
Tooele, Utah.

The Oak Ridge site is not under consideration as a permanent storage site, because it does not have the necessary space, and because mercury storage there is not part of the mission of the complex (Draft EIS, page 2-9). Both trucks and railroads would be used to move the mercury from its current storage locations to the location chosen for long-term storage (Draft EIS, page 2-10). Consolidated storage is the Preferred Alternative (Draft EIS, pages ES-1 and 1-1).

Alternative 3, sale of the mercury inventory (Draft EIS, page 2-14). In regard to this alternative, the Draft EIS considers the following choices:

Alternative 3A, sale at maximum allowable market rate (Draft EIS, page 2-15). In this case, mercury from the four stockpiles would be sold at a set rate, calculated not to disrupt the world mercury market, until all the stockpiles are depleted. Buyers would be producers and users of mercury.

Alternative 3B, sale to reduce mercury mining (Draft EIS, page 2-16). In this case, mercury from the four stockpiles would be sold to a mercury mining company with the stipulation that mining would be reduced proportionately to compensate for the release of mercury from the stockpiles.

Under the Preferred Alternative, consolidated storage, mercury would be moved to the receiving storage site by train or truck (Draft EIS, page 4-36). Mercury would be moved to foreign buyers or the mercury mining firm in the same way under Alternative 3, the sale alternative (Draft EIS, pages 4-52 and 4-61).

Commentor No. 30: Virginia Department of Environmental Quality Ellie L. Irons (continued)

Mr. Dennis Lynch
Page 3

Comments on the Mercury Management Proposals

The only potential impacts of either of the action alternatives (Alternatives 2 and 3) on Virginia resources would result from accidents or incidents in shipping mercury from Oak Ridge to the Somerville, New Jersey site or possibly the Romulus, New York through Virginia. As indicated in the Draft EIS, the risk of accidents or incidents involving mercury shipments is a function of number of shipments, routes, total mileage, and the likelihood of a mechanically induced fatality or a fire. The Draft EIS characterizes this likelihood, causing a release of mercury, as low. It characterizes the likelihood of a mercury release associated with a truck or rail accident as moderate; and the likelihood of a spill into a waterway as negligible (page 4-36).

Given the uncertainties related to particular risks in Virginia from such transport, we recommend that DLA consult with appropriate Virginia agencies when planning truck or train deliveries traversing the state. Specifically, we recommend the following agencies be contacted at the appropriate time, e.g., once a route through Virginia is determined and before the shipment takes place:

Department of Transportation. DLA should coordinate with the Virginia Department of Transportation's Emergency Operations Center to determine road and traffic conditions (Perry Cogburn, telephone (804) 786-2848). The Emergency Operations Center (or the Department of State Police; see below) can advise about height, weight, and size restrictions and prohibitions on tunnel travel in the eastern part of the Commonwealth.

Department of State Police. DLA should contact the Duty Sergeant at the Administrative Headquarters of the State Police to provide notification that shipments through Virginia are to take place. The position is filled day and night; the telephone number is (804) 674-2026. The State Police can also provide advice concerning truck travel restrictions. RT-1

Department of Rail and Public Transportation. DLA should coordinate with this Department (Kevin Page, telephone (804) 786-3963) regarding selection and use of rail routes in the Commonwealth.

There are other agencies which might be involved in case of an accident or incident involving the transport of mercury shipments through the Commonwealth. In regard to emergency response relative to air or water pollution incidents, the Department of Emergency Management cooperates with the Department of Environmental Quality's Pollution Response Program. In such cases, the two agencies share telephone reporting for emergencies as follows:

Commentor No. 30: Virginia Department of Environmental Quality Ellie L. Irons (continued)

Mr. Dennis Lynch
Page 4

Regular business hours: telephone (800) 468-8892
Nights and weekends: telephone (804) 674-2400.

For additional information, the Department of Emergency Management's web site is http://www/vaemergency.com/about/#whoweare. The Department of Environmental Quality's web site on the Pollution Response Program provides regional office contact information for reporting of emergencies. See http://www.deq.state.va.us/prep/how2rpt.html. **RT-1 (cont'd.)**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft EIS.

Sincerely,

Ellie L. Irons
Program Manager
Office of Environmental Impact Review

cc: Kevin Page, DRPT
Perry Cogburn, VDOT-TEOC
Ronald Rice, DSP
Ed Wallingford, VDOT
David Grimes, VDOT

Commentor No. 31: Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen Marla J. Irving et al.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE COUNTY OF ALLEN

April 30, 2003

LINDA K. BLOOM
MARLA J. IRVING
EDWIN J. ROUSSEAU

Vice Adm. Keith W. Lippert, SC, USA
Defense Logistics Agency
Suite 2533
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Fort Belvoire, VA 22060-6221

Dear Vice Adm. Lippert:

At today's Legislative Session of the Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen, Indiana, we unanimously approved a resolution opposing the consolidation of federal mercury stockpiles at New Haven Depot. A copy of that resolution is enclosed. AC-1

We do not feel that the Defense Logistics Agency has made a compelling case for consolidating these stockpiles in a single location. In fact, a large stockpile of mercury would be an appealing target for a terrorist attack. Also, a large amount of such a poisonous material in a single place would place an unmanageable burden on our community in the event of a disaster, man-made or natural, that might result in a release. RA-1

The storage of toxic materials has historically caused divisions within our community. Bringing in a large inventory of mercury would intensify this problem, without any subsequent economic or other benefit to the area. SE-2

Finally, we believe it would be difficult to transport additional mercury into the current depot without hauling it through populated areas of New Haven. RT-1

As County Commissioners, we take our responsibility to protect the welfare of our community very seriously. We feel that consolidating the federal stockpile of mercury in New Haven would jeopardize the safety of Allen County residents.

The Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen

Marla J. Irving, president

Edwin J. Rousseau, vice president

Linda K. Bloom, secretary

Enclosure

Commentor No. 31: Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen Marla J. Irving et al. (continued)

Resolution Number 4-30-03-18

A RESOLUTION OF
THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
OF THE COUNTY OF ALLEN COUNTY, INDIANA,
OPPOSING THE CONSOLIDATION OF FEDERAL MERCURY STOCKPILES
AT NEW HAVEN DEPOT

WHEREAS, the United States Defense Logistics Agency desires to consolidate its stockpiles of mercury at a single, central location; and

WHEREAS, the Defense Logistics Agency is considering New Haven Depot (formerly Casad Depot) as a potential site for this central stockpile; and

WHEREAS, mercury is a virulent poison that must be stored with absolute commitment to preventing release into the environment; and SB-1

WHEREAS, a large stockpile of such a poisonous material, in a single place, would create an unmanageable burden on the local community in the event of an accident or disaster, natural or manmade, that caused a release; and RA-1

WHEREAS, a large stockpile of mercury would create an appealing target for terrorism close to populated portions of New Haven, Indiana, and RA-2

WHEREAS, the storage of hundreds of tons of such a toxic material would create great community upset and concern without any positive impact on the community. SE-2

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen opposes location of a consolidated mercury stockpile at the New Haven Depot. AC-1

Furthermore, the Board of Commissioners requests that the Defense Logistics Agency eliminate New Haven Depot from consideration as the site for any future consolidation of its mercury inventory.

APPROVED ON THIS 30th Day of April, 2003 by the Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen, Indiana

Marla J. Irving

Marla J. Irving, president

Edwin J. Rousseau

Edwin J. Rousseau, vice-president

Linda K. Bloom

Linda K. Bloom, secretary

Commentor No. 32: New Haven Adams Township Fire Department John Bennett

New Haven Adams Township Fire Department

CHIEF'S OFFICE - 910 HARTZELL ROAD - NEW HAVEN, INDIANA 46774 - (260) 493-7500 FAX (260) 493-7700

Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060-6223
Attention: Project Manager
MM EIS, DNSC-E

April 11, 2003

Re: Comments/Concerns – DNSC-E
Mercury Management Proposal

We are the fire department responsible for the New Haven Depot located in New Haven, Indiana. After reviewing your Impact Statement, dated April 2003, regarding excess Mercury, I wish to submit the following comments and concerns.

1) It is my recommendation that ALL Mercury storage at the New Haven Depot be discontinued and remaining quantities be sold, disposed of or sent to other storage facilities. AN-1

2) Mercury storage at the New Haven site has been on location for over forty (40) years and with constant deteriation of containers, packaging, pallets and the like have created an unsafe and unpredictable condition. SB-1

3) The product and containers will surely fail due to age; it is just a matter of when.

4) The New Haven Depot is no longer a remote, isolated area. Within a close proximity there are over 25,000 citizens.

5) The area has grown and expanded with industry and commercial occupancies with more potential growth which is paramount in these declining economic conditions. Indiana has lost more manufacturing jobs than any state in the country. If this site is chosen for consolidated storage, it will surely stop any future growth in the area. SE-2

Commentor No. 32: New Haven Adams Township Fire Department John Bennett (continued)

6) This mercury storage along with the other commodities all have potential environmental risk contamination that directly affects the community. **RN-1**

7) Emergency services do not have adequate resources, training and specialized equipment to safely handle a mercury emergency. The nearest agency that is capable of mitigating the incident are at best 10 to 12 hours away. **ER-1**

8) The New Haven site is in very close proximity to several major highways (State Road 14, U.S. 30 and Interstate I469) plus a very heavily traveled railroad in which passes directly in front of this facility. During an emergency, these routes would very possibly have to be closed until the situation was under control and necessary resources were on site. This would cause an undue hardship to the community. **ER-1**

9) Your decision on which storage site is chosen should not be based on lowest cost estimates, rather more importantly, population density and economic impact to the community. **DM-1**

I appreciate the opportunity to review this proposal. If you have any additional questions regarding our concerns, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

John Bennett

John Bennett
Fire chief

Commentor No. 33: Common Council of the City of New Haven Honorable Terry E. McDonald and Brenda Adams

RESOLUTION NO. R-03-8

A RESOLUTION OPPOSING CONSOLIDATION OF MERCURY STOCKPILES AT THE DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY NEW HAVEN DEPOT

WHEREAS, the United States Defense Logistics Agency desires to consolidate its stockpiles of mercury at a single, central location; and

WHEREAS, the Defense Logistics Agency is considering its New Haven Depot (formerly Casad Depot) as a potential site for this central stockpile; and

WHEREAS, mercury is a virulent poison that must be stored with absolute commitment to preventing release into the environment; and SB-1

WHEREAS, a large stockpile of such poisonous material, in a single place, would create an unmanageable burden on the local community in the event of an accident or disaster, natural or manmade, that caused a release; and RA-1

WHEREAS, the storage of hundreds of tons of such a toxic material would create great community upset and concern without any positive impact on the community. SE-2

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the New Haven City Council opposes the location of a consolidated mercury stockpile at the New Haven Depot.

Furthermore, the City of New Haven requests that the Defense Logistics Agency eliminate New Haven Depot from consideration as the site for any future consolidation of its mercury inventory. AC-1

This Resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of New Haven this 13th day of May, 2003.

Terry E. McDonald
Presiding Officer

ATTEST:
Brenda Adams
Brenda Adams, Clerk-Treasurer

This Resolution presented by me to the Mayor on the 13th day of May, 2003, at the hour of 7:48 p.m.

Brenda Adams
Brenda Adams, Clerk-Treasurer

This Resolution approved and executed by me on the 13th day of May, 2003, at the hour of 7:49 p.m.

Terry E. McDonald
Terry E. McDonald, Mayor

Commentor No. 34: Tim Schiel

Registration FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

NEW HAVEN, INDIANA **MAY 20, 2003**

ATTENDEE INFORMATION:

Name Tim Schiel

Title

Organization

Address 2516 Beechwood Cir

City FW State IN Zip 46807

Phone 452-3459

E-mail Address

Will you provide oral comments at this meeting? ☐ Yes ☒ No

A comment was made on a radio interview Monday that the Mercury is not waste, but could be used + sold.
How much of the current stockpile has been sold since the first material was moved here?

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

PN-2

Commentor No. 35: New Haven, Indiana, Mayor's Youth Advisory Committee Alecia Martin

Registration FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

NEW HAVEN, INDIANA **MAY 20, 2003**

ATTENDEE INFORMATION:

Name Alecia Martin

Title Vice ~~Pe~~ Chairman

Organization Mayor's Youth Advisory Committee

Address 3820 Green Rd.

City New Haven State IN Zip 46774

Phone 260) 749-9331

E-mail Address

Will you provide oral comments at this meeting? ☐ Yes ☑ No

The health of our community is at risk. No Mercury! RN-1

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 36: Melvin Krueckeberg

Registration FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

NEW HAVEN, INDIANA **MAY 20, 2003**

ATTENDEE INFORMATION:

Name Melvin Krueckeberg

Title

Organization

Address 9519 Iroquois Trace

City New Haven State IN Zip

Phone

E-mail Address

Will you provide oral comments at this meeting? ❑ Yes ❑ No

How can we be sure maybe your 20,000,000 is for real or a talking point. as for safety the government told the people downwind in St. George Utah not to worry about the atomic tests years later they die like mad from the tests CB-1 RN-1

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 37: John C. Bedwell

Registration FORM

IN

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

NILES, ~~OHIO~~ **MAY 22, 2003**

ATTENDEE INFORMATION:

Name John C. Bedwell

Title

Organization Teacher

Address 11525 Edgerton Rd

City New Haven State In Zip 46774

Phone 260-749-5317

E-mail Address

Will you provide oral comments at this meeting? ? ❑ Yes ❑ No

I am not for this!! not sure

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

AP-1

Commentor No. 38: Susie Renfrow

Registration FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

NEW HAVEN, INDIANA **MAY 20, 2003**

ATTENDEE INFORMATION:

Name Susie Renfrow

Title

Organization

Address 817 Courtney Drive

City New Haven State IN Zip 46774

Phone 260-704-2889

E-mail Address renfrows@ipfw

Will you provide oral comments at this meeting? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Can we remove the mercury?

DM-3

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 39: Robert Hughes

Registration FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

NEW HAVEN, INDIANA **MAY 20, 2003**

ATTENDEE INFORMATION:

Name Robert Hughes

Title Pres.

Organization TFE Inc.

Address 6912 Trafalgar

City New Haven State IN Zip

Phone 260-493-3223

E-mail Address bhughes@tfe-inc.com

Will you provide oral comments at this meeting? ☐ Yes ☑ No

Totally against bringing mercury to this location.

AC-1

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 40: Karen Schafbuch

Registration FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

NEW HAVEN, INDIANA **MAY 20, 2003**

ATTENDEE INFORMATION:

Name Karen Schafbuch

Title

Organization

Address 7111 Bohnke Dr

City Ft Wayne State IN Zip 46815

Phone 260-493-1621

E-mail Address

Will you provide oral comments at this meeting? ☐ Yes ☒ No

I strongly object to storing more Mercury in New Haven!!! It is too close to largely populated areas with schools, churches and residential areas
It makes us a prime target for terrorist attacks. There are plenty of barren land in the west they could store it without endangering a large population.
Karen Schafbuch

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

AC-1

Commentor No. 41: Tammy Zeigler

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name Tammy Zeigler

Address 1205 Hartzell St.

Organization

City New Haven ~~IN~~ State IN Zip 46774

Phone 260-748-4102

E-mail Address NA

COMMENTS:

You have put nuclear waste in the Adam Center landfill And now You want to bring Mercury here. Find some other Place. We All (Ft. wayne + New Haven) know that there is nuclear waste At the land fill. Quit Poluting the landfills. OS-3 AC-1 OS-3

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: *(888) 306-6682*
toll free fax: *(888) 306-8818*
e-mail: *information@mercuryeis.com*
website: *www.mercuryeis.com*

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 42: David Gilbert

CommentFORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name David Gilbert

Address 2530 Sunnymede Dr.

Organization N/A homeowner.

City Fort. Wayne State IN Zip 46803

Phone 749-7868

E-mail Address

COMMENTS:

I Live in the Ft. Wayne District, but my Kid's, go to New Haven school's. I am on the Border of Ft. Wayne & New Haven in the Sunnymede Addition. I went to Appraise my home AND they wouldn't Appraise it for what I owed Because of the mercury that is what the Appraiser told me. ~~I.~~ It was for ~~a~~ Refinance. SE-2

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:

Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: *(888) 306-6682*
toll free fax: *(888) 306-8818*
e-mail: *information@mercuryeis.com*
website: *www.mercuryeis.com*

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 43: Ronald F. Dager

May 19, 2003

Dear Sir:

I am writing to voice my concern about the depositing of all the United States Government's supply of mercury at the Casad Depot in New Haven, Indiana. Although we have stored mercury among other government stock piled items, we should not have to become the sole storage facility for mercury in the United States. I believe it would better to store this mineral in one of the Western States, which is not as near to a town and a city of over 250,000 people. New Haven has had to fight to rid our community of a hazardous dump. It would not be fair to store other hazardous material at the Casad Depot. AC-1

Sincerely,

Ronald F Dager - 9510 Pawnee Way New Haven, In 46774

Ronald F. Dager

Commentor No. 44: Sandra A. Dager

May 19, 2003

Dear Sir:

I am writing to express my opposition to the depositing of all the United States Government's supply of mercury at the Casad Depot in New Haven, Indiana. We have some mercury among other things stored at the Depot. I believe it would be in everyone's best interest to store this mineral in one of the Western States, which is not as densely populated. New Haven has had to contend with a hazardous waste dump, which we fought to close at a great expense to our community. We do not want to become the storehouse for other hazardous material. Thank you for your consideration in this matter. AC-1

Sincerely,

Sandra A. Dager - 9510 Pawnee Way, New Haven, IN 46774

Sandra A. Dager

Commentor No. 45: City of New Haven
Honorable Terry A. Werling

Att: Project Manager Mercury Management EIS, DNCS-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road Ste. 3229
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
(888)306-6682

May 20, 2003

Would APPRECIATE AS MAJORITY OF Allen County THAT you will select ONE OF THE OTHER SITES.

THE County AND City OF New Haven HAS THE CONSES OF OPINION THAT ENOUGH IS ENOUGH. AC-1

PLEASE DO THE County AND City of New Haven A HUGE FAVOR AND DO NOT LOCATE ANY MORE MECURY AT THE DOOR STEP OF OUR COMMUNITY.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR VALUED CONSIDERATION.

TERRY A WERLING
Council AT LARGE
City OF New HAVEN, IN
46774

Commentor No. 46: Bettie Downs

Grand Valley
Daylily Society

5/30/03

Comment re: Mercury storage in New Haven, IN

After reading the ~~cov~~ newspaper coverage, it sounds to me that mercury storage is safe. The only concerns by the few who commented against storage in New Haven (few as compared to the entire population) seems to be the "perception" that there are safety issues. "Perception" is not reality. These issues should be decided upon based on real facts. I think the vast majority of New Haven resident just don't really care. What percentage of the population have cared enough to comment? RN-1 DM-1 PP-4

Thank you,

Bettie Downs
Co-owner of business property
982 Kochheiser Dr
New Haven, IN 46774

Commentor No. 47: Monell Pascarella

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name Monell Pascarella

Address 2737 Anderson-Morris Rd.

Organization

City Niles State Oh Zip 44446

Phone n/

E-mail Address na

COMMENTS:

I was glad that an open forum was allowed to let our community know about the mercury. I was highly impressed with the way the mercury was stored, I have no problem with the mercury being in Warren. AN-1

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:

Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: (888) 306-6682
toll free fax: (888) 306-8818
e-mail: information@mercuryeis.com
website: www.mercuryeis.com

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 48: Trumbull County Emergency Management Department (and Hazmat)
Donald Waldron

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name DONALD WALDRON

Address 1453 YOUNGSTOWN Kingsville Rd.

Organization TRUMBULL Co. Emergency MANAGEMENT

City VIENNA State OH Zip 44473

Phone 330 675-6602

E-mail Address

COMMENTS:

AS ASSISTANT CHIEF of TRUMBULL Co. HAZMAT I feel VERY COMFORTABLE WITH the WAY EVERYTHING IS PACKAGED & HANDLED & STORED. I SPOKE briefly to COMMISSIONER ANGELO AND HE is ALSO VERY HAPPY WITH the operations SB-1
Our Agency is 100% behind the operation At Warren DEPOT. If we can do ANYthing at all please CONTACT ME AT ANY TIME.

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: *(888) 306-6682*
toll free fax: *(888) 306-8818*
e-mail: *information@mercuryeis.com*
website: *www.mercuryeis.com*

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 49: Louise Copenhaver

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name Louise Copenhaver

Address Perin Rd.

Organization

City Warren State OH Zip 44481

Phone U/

E-mail Address ~~Wee~~ Weezer1017@aol.com

COMMENTS:

Mr. Holder was very informative and felt he did a good job explaining how the mercury was stored and I felt that the Warren site did the proper job. It doesn't concern me that the mercury is there.

AN-1

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:

Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: *(888) 306-6682*
toll free fax: *(888) 306-8818*
e-mail: *information@mercuryeis.com*
website: *www.mercuryeis.com*

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 50: Linda Pittano

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name Linda Pittano

Address 5929 Sharpe Rd.

Organization

City Warren State OH Zip 44481

Phone 330-847-6366

E-mail Address chico1226@aol.com

COMMENTS:

I think the mercury is being properly stored and it is in the best place possible. AN-1

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: *(888) 306-6682*
toll free fax: *(888) 306-8818*
e-mail: *information@mercuryeis.com*
website: *www.mercuryeis.com*

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 51: Gene Longo

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name Gene Longo

Address 1210 Lynn Dr.

Organization

City Warren State Oh Zip 44483

Phone o/

E-mail Address —

COMMENTS:

Warren Depot does a good job storing all their materials. Mercury was especially stored well. I have no problem with it being there. AN-1

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: *(888) 306-6682*
toll free fax: *(888) 306-8818*
e-mail: *information@mercuryeis.com*
website: *www.mercuryeis.com*

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 52: Ruth Longo

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name RUTH LONGO

Address 1210 LYNN DR.

Organization

City WARREN State OH Zip 44483

Phone ul

E-mail Address Rube227@aol.com

COMMENTS:

I felt the display and information given was very interesting. I thought the way the mercury was stored in a most efficient way. I was surprised and pleased that the mercury was stored as well as it was. I have no problem with the mercury being in Warren AN-1

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: *(888) 306-6682*
toll free fax: *(888) 306-8818*
e-mail: *information@mercuryeis.com*
website: *www.mercuryeis.com*

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 53: Indiana Department of Environmental Management Lori F. Kaplan

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

We make Indiana a cleaner, healthier place to live.

Frank O'Bannon
Governor

Lori F. Kaplan
Commissioner

100 North Senate Avenue
P.O. Box 6015
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6015
(317) 232-8603
(800) 451-6027
www.in.gov/idem

April 23, 2003

Mr. Cornel A. Holder
Defense Logistics Agency
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia 22060-6223

Dear Administrator Holder:

Re: Executive Summary for the Draft Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement

Thank you for your recent letters to Governor O'Bannon and to me, and for providing Indiana with copies of Defense Logistics Agency's draft Mercury Management Executive Summary. Governor O'Bannon has asked me to respond to you on his behalf.

Although I note that the draft summary states that the option to sell mercury was considered but eliminated from detailed study, I would like to state that Indiana does not support the idea of selling the mercury. AS-1

We do not completely oppose the proposal to maintain the mercury stockpiles in their current storage locations. I recently visited the New Haven Depot in New Haven, Indiana, and I was impressed with the safety parameters and level of precaution that is being taken at that storage facility.

At this time, however, we agree that the preferred alternative is to consolidate all mercury stockpiles for safe storage at another, central location. AC-1

In addition to sharing these initial, policy comments, please be aware that Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) technical staff is currently conducting an in-depth evaluation of the technical aspects of the draft mercury management environmental impact statement, and IDEM intends to provide additional comment, as appropriate, by the July deadline.

We at IDEM are interested in attending any meetings or hearings held in New Haven, Indiana. Please mail notification to Ms. Paula Smith with our Office of Planning and Assessment, IGCN 1301, IDEM, P.O. Box 6015, Indianapolis, IN 46206-6015. You may also contact Ms. Smith at 317/233-1210 or psmith@dem.state.in.us.

Recycled Paper An Equal Opportunity Employer *Please Recycle*

Commentor No. 53: Indiana Department of Environmental Management Lori F. Kaplan (continued)

Mr. Cornel A. Holder
Page Two

We appreciate your good efforts to work with Indiana in addressing mercury management issues.

Sincerely,

Lori F. Kaplan

Lori F. Kaplan
Commissioner

cc: Governor Frank O'Bannon
Paula Smith, IDEM, Office of Planning and Assessment

Commentor No. 54: United States House of Representatives Honorable Mark E. Souder

MARK E. SOUDER
3RD DISTRICT, INDIANA

GOVERNMENT REFORM COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY AND HUMAN RESOURCES
CHAIRMAN

RESOURCES COMMITTEE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

SPEAKER'S DRUG TASK FORCE
CO-CHAIRMAN

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
1227 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-4436

DISTRICT OFFICES:
E. ROSS ADAIR FEDERAL BUILDING
1300 SOUTH HARRISON STREET, ROOM 3105
FORT WAYNE, IN 46802
(260) 424-3041
(800) 959-3041
FAX: (260) 424-4042

FIRST SOURCE BANK BUILDING
102 WEST LINCOLN AVENUE, SUITE 250
GOSHEN, IN 46526
(574) 533-5802
(800) 959-3041

THE BOATHOUSE
700 PARK AVENUE, SUITE D
WINONA LAKE, IN 46590
(574) 269-1940
(800) 959-3041

www.house.gov/souder

STATEMENT OF U.S. REP. MARK SOUDER REGARDING THE PROPOSED LOCATION OF A MERCURY STOCKPILE AT THE NEW HAVEN DEPOT

May 20, 2003

I appreciate the opportunity to share my views on the New Haven Depot with you this evening. I have met with representatives of the Defense Logistics Agency/Defense National Stockpile and informed them of my strong opposition to the dumping of mercury in New Haven. AC-1

Moving our nation's 4,800-ton mercury stockpile into the New Haven Depot is not a viable option. When I visited the depot, the Defense Logistics Agency confirmed with me that there had been two minor leakage problems in New Haven's history, and while the CASAD facility has a good safety record, any spillage of such a dangerous substance as mercury is intolerable, especially in an urban environment. For this reason, I do not believe it is fair to subject a thriving community to this potentially dangerous situation. Not only would the storage of our nation's mercury be a potential environmental threat, it would also put New Haven on the map as a potential terrorist target. SB-3 RA-1

The residents of New Haven have been subjected to the importation of hazardous waste materials in the past. I supported the efforts of then-Mayor Shaw and "DumpStoppers" to stop the dumping of chemical waste in New Haven. Unless we cut the mercury problem off at the head, the Defense Department could use this consolidation as a gateway to bring in other hazardous materials. We in Indiana are tired of being perceived as a dumping ground for other people's waste and dangerous materials. OS-3

In my view, basic logic would suggest that if the potential for leakage exists, it is unwise to place storage facilities in urban areas. If the Defense Logistics Agency decides to consolidate the mercury, it should choose a more sparsely populated location. Designating New Haven as the home to our nation's mercury stockpile would amount to a "Keep Out" sign to all prospective new businesses looking to make New Haven their home. AC-1 SE-2

In April, I pledged to the people of New Haven to do everything in my power to block the consolidation of mercury at the New Haven Depot. Tonight I am reaffirming this pledge, and I will work with Senators Lugar and Bayh to keep this from happening. New Haven is a thriving community and I will work hard to make sure it stays that way.

****

Commentor No. 55: New Haven Chamber of Commerce
Ronald K. Oetting and Lawrence Lash

NEW HAVEN
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

428 Broadway • PO Box 66 • New Haven, Indiana 46774-0066 • 260/749-4484 (Phone & Fax)
newhavenchamber.org

May 20, 2003

Project Manager
MM EIS, DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road Ste 3229
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Re: MERCURY STORAGE / NEW HAVEN DEPOT

"The New Haven Chamber of Commerce is dedicated to encouraging the continued growth of the greater New Haven area through support of successful business and civic activities that enhance the quality of life for the family."

The Chamber's mission statement, as reiterated above, clearly reflects its membership's interests in the inherent principles of free enterprise, but just as clearly expects businesses to assume a stake in the prosperity of the community, the safety of our citizenry and responsible consideration for our environment.

The Chamber's Board of Directors has been elected to speak for the Chamber membership regarding any issues that the Board feels is in the best interest of its members and/or the community-at-large.

That being the case, the New Haven Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors hereby publicly proclaims its opposition to the continued use of New Haven Depot as a depository for massive amounts of mercury and soundly opposes additional quantities being amassed. We would strongly encourage the United States government to use other areas which are less-densely populated and removed from any influx of residences, schools, businesses and community venues.

AC-1

Innovative leadership and fresh vision from our current City administration and City Council promises a proud and prosperous future for our business community and our citizens. The Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors views this mercury storage depository as both being insalubrious for the city's image, and diametrically opposed to the quality of life the majority of our taxpayers prefer. We join Mayor Terry McDonald, City administrators and City Council members in opposing the consolidation of the national mercury stockpile in New Haven.

New Haven... "A Great Place to Live, Work, Shop & Worship"

Commentor No. 55: New Haven Chamber of Commerce Ronald K. Oetting and Lawrence Lash (continued)

Project Manager
MM EIS, DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
May 20, 2003
Page Two

With new housing development, a downtown revitalization program underway, and considerable commercial growth opportunity, New Haven should shed an image it's had for too long: that of a "dumping grounds" for everyone else's waste materials.

Respectfully,

Ronald K. Oetting
Chamber Board President

Respectfully,

Lawrence Lash
Chamber Board Vice-President

cc: Honorable Mark Souder
Honorable Mike Pence
Honorable Richard G. Lugar
Honorable Evan Bayh

Commentor No. 56: Karen A. Bedwell

I am really getting tired of being referred to as a NIMBY! If this is all so safe and carries NO depreciation to our property values, then let's find an empty warehouse in Coventry and have a guard watch the mercury while it sets in their backyards. This is not an issue of New Haven being the best and most economical area to place the mercury, it is an issue of what is best for the economic development of East Allen County. We MUST not allow ourselves to become the the low income suburb of Fort Wayne. We have our share of problem areas and we do not need to be further "BLIGHTED". Many of us have chosen to put our life energies into developing our homes to be our special havens and it is not right to sit back and willingly let our property values be affected. Many areas are completely residential and we did nothing to deserve to have further mercury head our way for storage. The mercury will bring no economic growth to our area and I stongly question the safety issues. Who's to say, someone might decide to even bomb the Casad Depot. The future and people's actions are many times out of our control. I was listening to Pat White tonight and he was discussing that New Haven is the least costly location to store this waste. Why would yhre cost be only $20,000 here and $60,000 in other areas. Why wouldn't population of the area be the biggest factor to consider the mercury placement. What happens when the mercury needs to be moved and disposed of? Can it ever be disposed? What are the uses for the mercury and what is the demand for it? Who wants it and what can it be used for? I was of the understanding this Depot is to be closed in the near future. Is it? And if so, yhen where does the mercury get moved to after we've suffered economic loss to our property values? Think further ahead and plan long-term and do away with a SHORT TERM FIX for A LONG TERM LOSS.

SE-2

RA-1

CB-1
DM-2

DD-1
AE-2

PN-2

PN-1

Karen A. Bedwell
11525 Edgerton Road
New Haven, IN 46774
260-749-5317

Commentor No. 57: Jamie Savastano

From the MM EIS Web site–

I won't be able to attend the hearing tonight about getting rid of the "Somerville Depot" of Mercury storage, but I just read your article in the Star Ledger online and felt I could at least get you another vote from my husband and I in Readington NJ to get the Depot out of Hillsborough. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 58: Diane Gorgy

From the MM EIS Web site–

I am concerned with the mercury storage at the Depot in Hillsborough, NJ for a variety of reasons. First and foremost, is that Hillsborough is a highly populated area. Second is that a large percentage of homes in the immediate area where the mercury is stored have well water with shallow wells (especially some of the older homes). Additionally, the depot where the mercury is stored is not particularly well guarded. Because it is easily assessable but not easily visible, the possibility of tampering with the mercury supply is probably high. This is a concern to me because there are lots of vehicles that utilize Roycefield Road (the County Roadworks storage area adjoins the property), so it would not be particularly suspicious to see trucks, heavy equipment, even helicopters approaching the property. With the amount of publicity this site has received recently, it could easily become a target for terrorists. **DM-2** **WR-1** **RA-2**

Commentor No. 59: Jeff Hanmann

From the MM EIS Web site–

Is the mercury considered a hazardous waste or a hazardous material? Different rules apply in the state of Utah. Is the Utah Industrial Depot (UID) storage facility qualified or have any experience storing mercury? Who is responsible for site security and emergency response? Who will pay for the security and monitoring upgrades at UID? Leave it where it is!!!!!!!!! **WM-1** **ER-2** **AN-1**

Commentor No. 60: Marie Zakaluk

CommentFORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name MARIE ZAKALUK

Address 225 EAST MOUNTAIN Rd
Hillsborough, NJ 08844

Organization EASTERLY

City Hillsborough State NJ Zip 08844

Phone 908-359-6213

E-mail Address mariezakaluk@juno.com

COMMENTS:

In addition to Hillsborough being a densely populated community, reason enough to remove not only mercury but all other possible hazmats, please consider 1) historicity AC-1
2) natural beauty
3) farm land destruction NP-1
4) negative impact on Hillsborough's transportation
5) economic development eg — property values

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: *(888) 306-6682*
toll free fax: *(888) 306-8818*
e-mail: *information@mercuryeis.com*
website: *www.mercuryeis.com*

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 61: Nicholas Amato

From the MM EIS Web site–

I live in Hillsborough on Fisher Drive. Take the mercury out of Hillsborough and put it in your backyard! **AC-1**

Commentor No. 62: Janet Havet

From the MM EIS Web site–

I live in Hillsborough NJ and appose the storage of ANY Mercury @ this location. Our area is highly populated to risk additional health concerns, and or terrorist actions!! Please pick a safer place to store this dangerous material. Thank you in advance. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 63: Mitchell Miles

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I'm scared that the mercury is located here (Hillsborough, NJ0 due to its proximity to a major airport and the population density of the area. I hope the federal government will make the right decision and remove it. It scares my family and I who all live in the area. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 64: Margauth Dimitrov-Kuhl

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I vehemently oppose storing huge quantities of such a toxic substance in such a densely populated area. The fact that this decision is based on public comment so that if enough people do not oppose this we might be stuck with this material flabbergasts me. Move it to the desert where there are less people. **AC-1** **DM-2** **AC-1**

Commentor No. 65: Roger Clayton

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

After the Indiana meeting I feel that the New Haven depot should be removed from the area. **PN-1**

Commentor No. 66: M. Lynn Kurek

June 19, 2003

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Huntsville Center

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed storage of the nation's supply of mercury in New Haven Indiana. I am a homeowner of property located in New Haven Indiana and I would be strongly opposed to this proposal for the following reasons: AC-1

1. New Haven is a strongly urban community within Allen County, which has a population of 330,000 people. The people here take great pride in their city and I feel that the storage of this stockpile would act as a deterrent to business and potential growth of this community. SE-2

2. I believe that this storage is an environmental danger. I do not want this risk in an area where many people are located. EC-1

3. I would fear that our city could become a target of terrorist activity. I think that this risk poses a real threat to the many citizens of the area. I am not sure that it would be in the best interest of our government to locate an entire stockpile of mercury in any one area for this and the above reasons. I think it should be dispersed amoung other sites so as not to become an attractive target for people of ill intent. RA-2

I understand that communities in Nevada and Utah have no problem with the idea of this stockpile being moved to their States. I would think that this would be the most logical solution, as these States do not have the urban population as Allen County. Again, the figure is 330,000 people in a concentrated area. AC-1

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

M Lynn Kurek

M. Lynn Kurek
3105 Elkwood Court
New Haven IN 46774
260-749-2425

Commentor No. 67: Campaign: Support for the Consolidated Storage Alternative

June 4, 2003

Project Manager
Mercury Management EIS
DNSC-E Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Dear Project Manager,

I applaud the recent draft environmental impact statement recommending long-term, consolidated storage of the nearly 5,000 metric tons of federal surplus mercury-rather than selling it or leaving it in its current multiple-storage locations.

I urge the adoption of the long-term storage proposal. I strongly oppose selling any of the stockpile, as too much mercury waste and emissions exist already, poisoning air and water, ending up in fish and other wildlife, and eventually poisoning us and our children. I also recommend against leaving the mercury in its current multiple locations, as this complicates good management and control over the surplus. AC-1

As of the year 2000, 5 million women of childbearing age had levels of mercury in their blood that would put unborn children at risk of mercury-related health problems. This is reason enough to seek the consolidated, long-term storage of this dangerous element rather than its sale or release.

Sincerely,

PEGGY RASMUSSEN
P O BOX 670
MARYVILLE, MO 64468-

Note: This represents 68 letters received from individuals and couples throughout the United States (see Table 2–2 of this volume).

Commentor No. 68: United States Fish and Wildlife Service Clifford G. Day

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

New Jersey Field Office
Ecological Services
927 North Main Street, Building D
Pleasantville, New Jersey 08232
Tel: 609/646 9310
Fax: 609/646 0352
http://njfieldoffice.fws.gov

In Reply Refer to:

EC-03/53

JUN 5 2003

Dennis Lynch
Mercury Management EIS, DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060-6223

Re: *Draft Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement, April 2003; Draft Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Report, April 2003;* and *Natural Resources Assessment for Defense Logistics Agency / Defense National Stockpile Center, Somerville, New Jersey, June 1998.*

Dear Mr. Lynch:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) reviewed the referenced documents provided by the Defense National Stockpile Center (DNSC). The DNSC is working to select and implement an approach for the 40-year management of the national defense stockpile of elemental mercury, which is no longer needed for defense. The stockpile is stored in 128,762 - 76 lb. steel flasks at four facilities across the country. In an April 2, 2003 cover letter presenting the referenced documents, the DNSC requested input from the Service on the presence or absence of federally listed threatened or endangered species in the vicinity of the Somerville Depot, Somerset County, New Jersey. The Somerville Depot houses 75,980 of the steel flasks. The flasks sit in sealed drums on drip pans in open warehouses. The DNSC has proposed three alternatives for the management of the national stockpile:

1. keep the stockpile at the four locations (no action alternative);
2. consolidate the stockpile at one of the four locations (preferred alternative); and
3. sell the stockpile in bulk or gradually to overseas markets.

AUTHORITY

The following comments provide technical assistance for federally listed threatened and endangered species only and do not constitute consultation for any project pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) or comments by the Service as afforded by the December 22, 1993 Memorandum of Agreement among the

Commentor No. 68: United States Fish and Wildlife Service Clifford G. Day (continued)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP), and the Service, if project implementation requires a permit from the NJDEP pursuant to the New Jersey Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act (N.J.S.A. 13:9B *et seq.*); nor do they preclude comments on any environmental documents pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 as amended (83 Stat. 852; 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*).

THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

Except for an occasional transient bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), no other federally listed or proposed threatened or endangered flora or fauna under Service jurisdiction are known to occur within the vicinity of the Somerville Depot. The nearest known active site for such a species is at least 10 miles from the depot. This letter provides information on federally threatened and endangered species in the immediate vicinity of the Somerville Depot only. The New Jersey Field Office cannot provide Section 7 consultation on the alternatives discussed in the draft EIS or all potential impacts (*e.g.*, from transportation) without knowledge that consolidation is the selected alternative, that consolidation would occur at the Somerville Depot, and without information for how, when, and where the material would be transported. The responsibility of such a consultation would go to a regional or national office in order to consolidate comments on the inter-state movement of hazardous material. EC-3

Additional comments have been provided to the Service's Northeast Regional Office and will be incorporated into a more comprehensive response to the referenced documents. For further information regarding coordination with our Regional Office, please contact:

Tom Healy, Acting Regional Director
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
300 Westgate Center Drive
Hadley, MA 01035
(413) 253-8300

Thank you for the opportunity to review the *Draft Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement*, *Draft Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Report*, and *Natural Resources Assessment for Defense Logistics Agency / Defense National Stockpile Center, Somerville, New Jersey*. If you have any questions regarding the above comments, please contact Brian Marsh of my staff at (609) 646-9310 extension 21.

Sincerely,

Timothy Kubiak

for Clifford G. Day
Supervisor

2

Commentor No. 69: Allison Van Zandt

Project Manager,

I am writing you today in opposition to the national Mercury stockpile being located in New Haven, Indiana at the Casad Depot. Such a hazard should not be located in Allen County Indiana because, in part, of our large population.

I am very concerned over the hazards that this risk may pose, and I don't feel there are adequate measures to ~~protec~~ protect the community from the associated hazards. AC-1

Please locate this stockpile in another facility. We do not want it here.

Allison Van Zandt

Commentor No. 70: Margauth Dimitrov-Kuhl

6/20/03

Attn: Project Manager
Mercury Management EIS
DNSC-E
8725 John J Kingman Rd
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA

FAX # 888-306-8818

It makes absolutely no sense to me that Hillsborough Twp be considered as a permanent mercury storage facility. AC-1

It also escapes me how such a seemingly commonsense decision should be based on public comment. I cannot think of any valid reason to have this facility in the most populated state in the US! Surely a more suitable location could be found outside the borders of major airports and densely populated communities. DM-1

I would hate to be the responsible person (ie decision-maker) should a catastrophe occur and an entire region be contaminated with the noxious fumes of a major mercury accident. Think ABOUT IT! RA-1

Margauth Dimitrov-Kuhl
Hillsborough NJ resident.

Commentor No. 71: Wethersfield Township
James Stoddard (Warren, Ohio Public Meeting)

Page 11

tour of the Warren depot facility today, and I was quite impressed with what I saw. The 40,000 square foot building was clean. It was well maintained, well lighted. The mercury units were well stored in a very safe manner. And again, in view of my background and my great concern for safety, it would seem to me that that facility is run very, very well, well managed, a very safe operation and certainly one to be considered for the possibility of storing all of the mercury.

MR. STODDARD: My name is James Stoddard, S T O D D A R D. I'm a Wethersfield Township trustee and the depot sits in Wethersfield Township. I had the opportunity to tour the site earlier this week. I was very impressed with the neatness, cleanliness, organization, and professionalism displayed by all the employees. The containment packaging of the mercury leaves no question in my mind that it is a safe environment. The metering of the mercury in the air was very impressive and was next to nothing as far as the mercury in the storage area. SB-1

Our township provides fire protection for ER-1

Commentor No. 71: Wethersfield Township
James Stoddard (Warren, Ohio Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 12

the area, and our fire chief and volunteer fire department are treated with high respect and they have cart blanche. They can visit the area anytime they wish. And they have toured the facility many times and are familiar with it. And they wish every site in the township was as safe as that one is. And that's really all I have to say.

ER-1 (cont'd.)

- - - -

MR. LAWSON: We have now gone through all of the people that are registered and for whom I have a registered list, that there have been no other individuals who have come to say that they would like to speak except for two or three individuals that came up privately. So at this point I would just note that there are no other people who would like to speak.

At this point then I would like to thank everyone once again for their participation as well as that of the court reporter and sign language interpreters. I would say please note that you may continue to submit comments until the comment period closes on July 18. And I would also remind you that the exhibit area is

Commentor No. 72: Regional Chamber
Ed Beil (Warren, Ohio Public Meeting)

Page 10

at least up until 8:30. At this point we will take a break and have an opportunity for people to ask questions or to discuss any issues they have with the officials that are here. I will call the meeting back, so if you would like to stick around you certainly are welcome to do so. If you choose not to, we thank you very much for coming tonight, particularly for coming and discussing with people at the exhibit areas some of the concerns that you might have and ask questions that you wanted to ask. And certainly for any comments that you have made in this session right here.

Before we break again, I would just ask is there anybody else who would like to make a comment now? If not, this session is recessed until such time that we have somebody else that would like to speak.

- - - - -

PRIVATE COMMENTS

MR. BEIL: My name is Ed Beil, B E I L, and I'm with the Regional Chamber. My profession is electrical engineer. I have been with Ohio Edison about 35 years, so I have a little knowledge of safety. I made the SB-1

Commentor No. 72: Regional Chamber
Ed Beil (Warren, Ohio Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 11

tour of the Warren depot facility today, and I was quite impressed with what I saw. The 40,000 square foot building was clean. It was well maintained, well lighted. The mercury units were well stored in a very safe manner. And again, in view of my background and my great concern for safety, it would seem to me that that facility is run very, very well, well managed, a very safe operation and certainly one to be considered for the possibility of storing all of the mercury.

SB-1 (cont'd.)

AC-1

MR. STODDARD: My name is James Stoddard, S T O D D A R D. I'm a Wethersfield Township trustee and the depot sits in Wethersfield Township. I had the opportunity to tour the site earlier this week. I was very impressed with the neatness, cleanliness, organization, and professionalism displayed by all the employees. The containment packaging of the mercury leaves no question in my mind that it is a safe environment. The metering of the mercury in the air was very impressive and was next to nothing as far as the mercury in the storage area.

Our township provides fire protection for

Commentor No. 73: City of Akron
Frederick Neugebauer (Warren, Ohio Public Meeting)

Page 8

when he was coming in, he could not stay, he had another meeting tonight, but I talked to Sally and the three commissioners are coming down to view the facility too. He said if I'm happy and the agency is happy, we'll do whatever it takes to make you happy. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. I appreciate your comments.

The second person I have on the list is Ken Nussle.

MR. NUSSLE: I decline.

MR. LAWSON: The other person I have is Frederick, is it Neugebauer?

MR. NUSSLE: N E U G E B A U E R.

MR. LAWSON: Okay.

MR. NEUGEBAUER: Okay. I am an industrial engineer with the city of Akron. And in regard to the protection of the environment, the city of Akron strongly opposes the resumption of sale of mercury stockpiles on the commodities market. This is a concern with respect to the negative impact on the environment and the fact that the circumstances of the concerns have not changed with respect to AS-1

Commentor No. 73: City of Akron
Frederick Neugebauer (Warren, Ohio Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 9

1 the environment and the negative impact as
2 experienced by fish advisories throughout the
3 country because of mercury contamination of fish
4 which is a result of mercury in the consumer
5 products that are available throughout the
6 country.
7 I also would stress a concern with the
8 oversight of the inspection of the facilities.
9 And while I agree that there is excessive
10 protection for mercury spills, I still think
11 that there is a need for oversight by someone
12 outside of the controlling agency so that the
13 public is assured that integrity is maintained
14 in recordkeeping for the protection of the
15 public.
16 MR. LAWSON: Great. Thank
17 you very much. All right. At this point I have
18 nobody else on my list here, but I'm certainly
19 going to open it up to see if is there anybody
20 else who would like to offer a comment.
21 Okay. Now, the schedule for the evening,
22 if there is nobody else who likes to speak now,
23 I'm going to recess for a time and I will
24 reconvene as soon as there is somebody that I
25 understand would like to make a formal comment

AS-1 (cont'd.)

EP-1

Commentor No. 74: Trumbull County Hazmat (and Emergency Management Department)
Don Waldron (Warren, Ohio Public Meeting)

Page 7

MR. KING: Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: And since we don't have your name listed, would you give us your name and affiliation again for us, please?

MR. WALDRON: My name is Don Waldron. I'm the assistant chief for Trumbull County Hazmat. I'm also with the Trumbull County Emergency Management Department.

I have been to quite a number of facilities now over the last couple of years, and I was invited in to see the actual over-packing system down there. And from observing it and watching everything that is done the way it is, my feeling is I would prefer to handle an emergency in that type of an environment with the over-packing that they are doing rather than I would out on the highway. AN-1 This is a much safer operation. It's a much safer way to store the mercury itself. And the way it's done and the way it's professionally handled down there, I don't think you are going to find it any better. And I really want to show my support for this agency.

I talked to my boss out in the parking lot

Esquire Deposition Services D.C - 1-800-441-3376 MD - 1-800-539-6398

Commentor No. 75: Warren Fire Department
Captain Curtiss King (Warren, Ohio Public Meeting)

Page 5

use the microphone just to make sure we get a good record. I know you are with the fire department. Hopefully there will be no fires for the next five minutes. Please go ahead.

MR. KING: I have a few comments that I would like to say. A few things.

My name is Curtiss King, I'm with the Warren Fire Department. I am a captain with 25 years service. We are a neighboring community to the Wethersfield Township storage facility. Some of the concerns I have are due to my training in hazardous materials. I'm a hazmat tech for the City of Warren. And the concern that I have tonight through talking with the various individuals is the transportation of the material. If this site is picked here in our local area, I notice that there are several different ways that the material is packaged at this time at different sites. I would urge whoever is in charge of this packaging system to make sure that the packaging is done in the over-package way that it's done at the facility here already before it is transported. RT-1

I understand that one of the facilities

Commentor No. 75: Warren Fire Department
Captain Curtiss King (Warren, Ohio Public Meeting)
(continued)

Page 6

wanting to get rid of their material may not have the room for that packaging to be done. I would like to see that that room is made on site or as close to on site before the material is moved to protect the environment and everyone involved in the transportation of this material. RT-1 (cont'd)

The other thing I would like to see happen, I'm not sure what channel to use, is that possibly conversations could be made to our United Nations as to a production worldwide of this mercury product. I have only been made aware of this product a few weeks ago and its danger to the environment. I would like to see that the surplus we have be used in some way around the world instead of more being produced so that we can negate any future contamination with this product. AS-1

At this time I would like to ask that I could possibly give the last minute or two of my speaking time to Mr. Donny Waldron. I respect this man's opinion very much as to the validity of the packing process in the storage facility we have here. He did not know where to sign up. We discussed it earlier. Is that possible?

MR. LAWSON: Yes.

Esquire Deposition Services **D.C - 1-800-441-3376** **MD - 1-800-539-6398**

Commentor No. 76: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

We are residents of Hillsborough Township and would like to have the mercury and all other hazardous materials stored at the depot removed as soon as possible. When it was located in New York people in that area came down with cases of cancer. The quicker we remove it the better for the safety of people in Hillsborough. **DM-3** **OS-3** **RN-1**

Commentor No. 77: Rudy Urena

From: Rudy Urena (Hillsborough Resident)
Date: June 30, 2003
Subject: Mercury stockpile
Attention: Project manager, Mercury management EIS

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to formally submit my comment regarding the mercury stockpile stored in Hillsborough. Like many other Hillsborough residents, I am very concerned about the stockpile being stored in such a densely populated area. With other viable storage locations, such as the one in Hawthorne, Nev., it is irresponsible to store this material in an area where it can do harm to so many Americans in an event of a disaster. **AC-1**

While I'm sure that the location is suitable for storage under ideal conditions, in this day and age why risk the lives or well being of our children unnecessarily. I ask that the right decision be made and that the stockpile be moved out of Hillsborough.

Sincerely yours,

Rudy Urena

Commentor No. 78: Roseanne Salamone

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I would like to place a complaint on the mercury storage dump in Hillsborough. I am surprised this type of a populated area would have this type of dump. It should be in an area with no population around due to concerns of terrorism and the area airports. I hope that a decision is made to move it to a less populated area. Thank you. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 79: New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Michael Valent

State of New Jersey

James E. McGreevey
Governor

Department of Environmental Protection

Bradley M. Campbell
Commissioner

Division of Fish and Wildlife
Endangered and Nongame Species Program
Northern Region Office
7A Van Syckels Road
Hampton, NJ 08827
Phone: (908) 735-8975
Fax: (908) 735-9891
Email: nromvalent@nac.net
Visit:njfishandwildlife.com

June 17, 2003

Cornel A. Holder
Defense Logistics Agency
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Dear Mr. Holder:

I am writing in reply to your April 2, 2003 letter to Andy Didun requesting information on state-listed endangered and threatened (E & T) species near the Somerville Depot in Hillsborough, New Jersey. I have reviewed our database of E & T species locations and Landscape Project maps that delineate critical E & T habitat in New Jersey for any potential impacts from the proposed management of excess mercury at the Somerville Depot.

The nearest grassland bird habitat is located approximately 0.1 mi. to the northwest of the Somerville Depot between the railroad tracks and Dukes Brook and extends to the north. Additional grassland bird habitat is located approximately 1.4 mi. to the west of Somerville Depot. Despite the close proximity of suitable grassland bird habitat to the site, it is our opinion that the proposed project will not result in any adverse impacts to these species. EC-3

The nearest wood turtle habitat is located more than 1.5 mi. to the south. The proposed project will have no impact on wood turtle populations in the vicinity of Somerville Depot.

Please be advised that any future correspondence pertaining to state-listed endangered and threatened species should be directed to: Larry Niles, Chief, Endangered and Nongame Species Program, P.O. Box 400, Trenton, NJ 08625-0400.

Sincerely,

Michael Valent
Principal Zoologist

New Jersey is an Equal Opportunity Employer

Commentor No. 80: Danielle Greco-Nieland

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I have lived in Hillsborough for more than 16 years. This is not a place to store Mercury. Hillsborough has too many people. Mercury can be very poisonous. No matter how safely it is stored an accident can occur or a terrorist could attack and it could cause much devastation in the community. It does not belong here. Please move it out. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 81: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I'm calling in response to the article in the Hillsborough beacon on June 19, 2003. I was unaware of the situation prior to moving here five-years ago. I feel strongly that the government has a responsibility to move this material to a more remote site. It is no longer suitable to be housed here because the population is growing so considerably. It does not belong here. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 82: Barbara Tarbell

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I am calling regarding the mercury stored in Hillsborough New Jersey. I am a resident and business owner in Hillsborough. New Jersey is way too populated for this type of a hazard—especially in this age of terrorism. The mercury should be moved as soon as possible. Thank you. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 83: Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials Jennifer R. Kaduck

Assocation of State and Territorial
ASTSWMO
Solid Waste Management Officials

444 North Capitol Street, NW, Suite 315
Washington, DC 20001
tel: (202) 624-5828 fax: (202) 624-7875
www.astswmo.org

July 7, 2003

Attention: Project Manager
Mercury Management EIS
DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

The purpose of this correspondence is to provide the Defense National Stockpile Center (DNSC) with comments regarding the Draft Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), announced in the *Federal Register* on April 11, 2003 (68 FR 17787) on behalf of the Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials (ASTSWMO). ASTSWMO is a national, non-partisan, non-profit organization representing the State waste managers who implement the nation's State waste and remediation programs. ASTSWMO is a member organization of the Quick Silver Caucus (QSC), a coalition of State associations formed to address and resolve health and environmental problems resulting from the release of mercury to the environment, and is a signatory to that coalition's separate comment letter on the Draft EIS. However, we have one additional issue that is association-specific which we wish to raise independently in the form of an official comment on the Draft EIS.

We refer to Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS, and its discussion of "Alternatives Considered and Eliminated from Detailed Study", paragraph 2.4, page 17. There DNSC determined that it would not consider treatment and storage (paragraph 2.4.2) , and treatment and disposal (paragraph 2.4.3). We understand the rationale that treatment may reduce marketability of the mercury, but as we are strongly opposed to the sales alternative, we do not consider that an adequate reason for dismissal of the option. We also fully understand the problems caused by the current lack of a reliable technology to stabilize the mercury for disposal, and have to acknowledge that despite recent attempts by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to identify such a technology, this is not a contemporary option available to DNSC. AE-2

However, we are deeply concerned that a federal department with the resources of the Department of Defense, with the potential for collaboration by the EPA and the Department of Energy, has apparently abandoned any intent of pursuing the disposal option for possible use at some point in the future. In effect, the declaratory language of the Draft EIS accepts storage as a permanent solution. We cannot agree with this as the definitive federal position on excess mercury stocks that cannot be responsibly sold nor used. We believe it is a federal responsibility to continue to pursue the necessary research required to find a safe disposal option, and believe the Draft EIS should be amended to reflect such an intent. We accept that it is impracticable to

-1-

Commentor No. 83: Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials Jennifer R. Kaduck (continued)

treat and dispose of the mercury in the time horizon of this EIS, but believe the federal government must continue to pursue permanent treatment technology that will eventually allow disposal of excess mercury that will never be used nor irresponsibly released into the markets. A federal document of such significance as this EIS must not carry the message or implication that this is an acceptable or permanent situation. AE-2 (cont'd.)

Thank you for this opportunity to provide our Association comments on this final draft.

Sincerely,

Jennifer R. Kaduck

Jennifer R. Kaduck
ASTSWMO President

-2-

Commentor No. 84: Valarie J. and Andrew Silva

Project Manger/Mercury, June 27,03

Hillsborough is not the place to store the entire countries mercury stockpile! It's a beautiful fast growing community in which we'd like to keep it this way. Theres too much access to small airports (3 that I can think of right off the top) and interstate highways. I see security at the depot as a major problem. I've heard stories of teenages going into that area + messing around also the rail road tracks that give easy access. This dangerous substance should be securely stored in the Neveda desert where the human population is nill. It could be guarded by professional personal. I moved here from Edison where I grew up as a child. Kimbac dump was

AC-1

RA-1

AC-1

Commentor No. 84: Valarie J. and Andrew Silva (continued)

there, that was one of the most toxic dumps in the country. Mustard gas + botulism, bad stuff! I never realized until I was an adult.

Please do the right thing + remove this mercury from Hillsborough. Every last barrel.

Please!!!

Sincerely,

Valarie J Silva

&

Andrew Silva

Valarie Silva
125 E. Mountain Rd.
Hillsborough, NJ 08844

AC-1

Commentor No. 85: Indiana Department of Natural Resources Michael W. Neyer

DNR Indiana Department of Natural Resources

Frank O'Bannon, Governor
John Goss, Director

Environmental Unit
Division of Water
402 W. Washington Street, Rm. W-264
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2641

25 June 2003

Mr. Dennis Lynch
Mercury Management EIS, DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060-6223

Re: DNR #10222 - Mercury Management Draft EIS; Allen County

Dear Mr. Lynch:

The Indiana Department of Natural Resources has reviewed the above referenced project per your request. Our agency offers the following comments for your information and in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

Formal approval by the Department of Natural Resources under the regulatory programs administered by the Division of Water is not required for this project. WR-2

The Natural Heritage Program's data have been checked. To date, no plant or animal species listed as state or federally threatened, endangered, or rare have been reported to occur in the project vicinity. EC-2

Our agency appreciates this opportunity to be of service and apologizes for not being able to respond sooner in this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact Christie Kiefer, Environmental Coordinator at (317) 232-4160 or at 1-877-928-3755 if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Neyer, PE
Director
Division of Water

Note: Please include the above DNR # on any future correspondence regarding this project.

An Equal Opportunity Employer
Printed on Recycled Paper

Commentor No. 86: Kevin Lyons

From the MM EIS Web site–

Over the years, the population in Hillsborough NJ has increased significantly. The time has come to move this mercury from Hillsborough to a more safe and secure area AWAY from a heavily populated area. There are environmental concerns and increased exposure to terrorist attacks. I urge you to move all the mercury from Hillsborough as soon as possible!! Thank you. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 87: Walker River Paiute Tribe Tad Williams

Dear Mr. Lynch,

A legal settlement between our tribe and the Hawthorne Army Depot was reached years ago. This agreement says the rail through our Reservation is for munitions only. Mercury disposal would be a violation of this legal agreement if it was transported via rail through our Reservation. **EP-2**

Tad Williams
Environmental Director
WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE
P.O. Box 220
Schurz, NV 89427

775 773 2306 ext. 113
fax: 775 773 2585
tadwms@gbis.com

Commentor No. 88: Sally M. Brown

From the MM EIS Web site–

I find this totally appalling that the DNSC, our State, County, and City Representatives and others involved would even consider storing this stuff here in Tooele County. I feel that we, as citizen of Tooele County and the State of Utah have more than our share of environmental wastes here in our County. Enough is enough. Let them store it where it is or somewhere else. We are a dumping ground for everything that no one else wants as it is. As I stated above. "ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!" **AC-1**

Commentor No. 89: Christine Hutchinson

From the MM EIS Web site–

We don't want the mercury stored in Somerville. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 90: Joseph Gallo

From the MM EIS Web site–

Please remove the mercury from the Hillsborough facility asap. Thanks! **AC-1**

Commentor No. 91: Maxine Sassell

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I am a Hillsborough, New Jersey resident and would like the 26,000 tons of mercury that you have been accumulating in Hillsborough to be removed. We have a large population and too many beautiful children and wonderful, hard working families in this area and don't want to have mercury located here. In case of another 9/11 type of accident we would be in a lot of trouble. A plane nearly crashed into the site a couple of years ago according to our chief of police. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 92: Mrs. Ameliano

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Mrs. Ameliano. I live in Hillsborough and I am outraged about all of this mercury located in Hillsborough. It is a densely populated area and it is not safe here. I've lived here 50 years and use to go to Packard's market every Friday with my parents to go shopping. It is located on the other side of the highway across from where the mercury is stored. There are areas in the desert where you could put that material. Please get it out of town. Thank you. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 93: Paula Cabrera

From: Paula Cabrera
Date: June 30, 2003
Subject: Mercury
Attention: Project manager, Mercury management EIS

To Whom It May Concern:

I am deeply concerned about the mercury stockpile stored in Hillsborough. We selected this city to raise our children in a safe environment and quite frankly I don't feel safe knowing that there is dangerous material being stored so close. With other viable storage locations, such as the one in Hawthorne, Nev., it is irresponsible to store this material in an area where it can harm so many people. **AC-1**

I hope that the right thing will be done and that the stockpile is relocated.

Sincerely yours,

Paula Cabrera

Paula Cabrera

Commentor No. 94: Alecia Florin

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I am a new Hillsborough resident and I am calling with regards to having more mercury in this area. All of the mercury should be removed from this area. It is a horrible situation. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 95: United States Fish and Wildlife Service Lynwood A. MacLean

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Bishop Henry Whipple Federal Building
1 Federal Drive
Fort Snelling, MN 55111-4056

IN REPLY REFER TO:

FWS/AES-HC
ER 03/348

November 14, 2003

Attention: Project Manager
MM EIS, DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060-6223

Dear Sir or Madam:

In June of 2003, Region 3 of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Mercury Management by the Defense Stockpile Center; Nevada, Indiana, Tennessee, New York, New Jersey, Utah, and Ohio. We provided comments to our Washington Office for consolidation into the overall Service comments to be sent to the Department of the Interior for incorporation into the Department's response to your agency. However, it has come to our attention that our comments were not included in the Department's letter of August 8, 2003. In response to an inquiry from the project consultant, Science Applications International Corporation, we are providing our original comments to you as they may be of some assistance in the preparation of the Final EIS and in other aspects of your decision making process. These comments deal only with the Indiana portion of the project. Our Reynoldsburg, Ohio, Field Office had provided a "no comment" response with respect to the Warren Depot, Ohio, aspects of the project.

SERVICE COMMENTS CONCERNING INDIANA PORTION OF PROJECT

Habitat and Water Quality

The DEIS does an adequate job of addressing the transportation and operational risks and impacts of the three proposed alternatives on wildlife habitat and water quality for the New Haven Depot in Allen County, Indiana.

Federally Listed Threatened and Endangered Species

There are three species with federal status whose range in Indiana includes Allen County: the Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), the bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), and the eastern massasauga rattlesnake (*Sistrurus catenatus catenatus*). EC-2

Commentor No. 95: United States Fish and Wildlife Service Lynwood A. MacLean (continued)

2

The Indiana bat is listed as federally endangered. The bat uses woodlands during the summer when maternity colonies utilize trees with loose bark for nesting. These bats forage primarily over wooded stream corridors, although they have been collected in grazed woodlots, mature deciduous forests, and pastures with trees. There are no recent records for the Indiana bat in Allen County and the site does not appear to provide any suitable habitat.

The bald eagle is listed as federally threatened. Allen County has some wintering records for bald eagles. Bald eagles nest in close proximity to lakes, rivers, or reservoirs. The eagles construct their nests near habitat ecotones, such as lakeshores, rivers, and timber management areas (clearcuts or selective cuts). Tolerance of human activity during the nesting season has been variable, but, ideally, human disturbance of eagles should be avoided. The bald eagle's food base from the watershed includes carrion, waterfowl, and especially fish. The proposed project should not have any impacts on bald eagles or their habitat.

EC-2 (cont'd.)

The eastern massasauga has been found in Allen County in a couple of the quadrangles on the west side of the City of Ft. Wayne. This species has recently been made a candidate species for listing under the Endangered Species Act (as amended). The habitat preference is varied and site dependent. Generally, they can be found in the grassy margins of wetlands, disturbed areas in early succession, and open areas such as prairies or meadows. The Allen County population is considered a disjunct population and the proposed project should not affect the snake or its habitat.

While the site itself does not provide habitat for any of the above mentioned species, the species may occur along the chosen transportation route(s) and should be briefly discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment), Section 3.2.7.2.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. If you have any questions concerning the comments and for continued technical assistance, please contact Robin McWilliams Munson of our Indiana Field Office (620 South Walker Street, Bloomington, Indiana 47403-2121) at (812) 334-4261 x 207 or you can call me at (612) 713-5330.

Sincerely,

Lyn MacLean

Lynwood A. MacLean
Regional Project Review Coordinator

cc: Ms. Sharon Pietzyk
Science Applications International Corporation
8301 Greensboro Drive, Mail Stop E58
McLean, VA 22102

Commentor No. 96: Maxine R. Zaslow

11 Dorchester Ct.
Hillsborough, N.J. 08844-4915

Project Manager
Mercury Management EIS
DNSC-E
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060

June 22nd, 2003

Dear Sirs:

As a resident of Hillsborough, I am extremely concerned about the 2600 tons of mercury – over half of the nation's stockpile – which is presently stored here. Hillsborough is a family-oriented town which is densely populated. We have many children. If either a natural or man-made disaster were to strike at the site where the mercury is currently stored, the result could be a catastrophy that might rival or surpass the one that happened on September 11th, 2001. RA-1

It is no longer practical, logical or moral to store mercury in Hillsborough. Please cut through the bureaucratic red tape and get it out of Hillsborough now! AC-1

Very truly yours,
Maxine R. Zaslow

Commentor No. 97: John Stevenson

July 1, 2003

To: The project manager, Mercury management EIS

I am writing to voice my concern about the mercury stockpile in Hillsborough, NJ. While I understand that this material needs to be stored somewhere, I don't understand why it is being stored in a heavily populated area.

AC-1

Like my neighbors I too feel that it is an inappropriate location to store this material and hope appropriate action is taken and the material be moved to a location where a catastrophic event will have less of an impact.

Yours truly,

John Stevenson

Commentor No. 98: Jackie Smith

June 29, 2003

Attention: Project manager, Mercury management EIS

I am a new resident of Hillsborough, NJ. I am writing to voice my concern about the mercury stockpile. In this age of uncertainty I cannot believe that a dangerous substance would be stored in a heavily populated city.

AC-1

There must be a better location to store this material where it would do less harm in the event of a disaster. There are a lot of concerned residents who I'm sure have or will voice their opinions. I hope that we can get beyond the bureaucracy and do what's right.

Sincerely yours,

Jackie Smith

Jackie Smith

Commentor No. 99: Terry Carpenter

From the MM EIS Web site–

As an employee of Y-12 and knowledgeable of the process that required the use of Mercury for weapons production. I feel that the movement of the excess material from the Y-12 site to another central consolidated site for long term storage or sale of the process material would be in the best interest of the NNSA and would support it fully. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 100: Marie Zakaluk (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting)

More so than ever. We have all these businesses. I myself have my family plus my daughter's, we encouraged her to buy her home here, she has her family, my grandchildren, and I consider Hillsborough a very productive and a very viable community. Not only for now, but for the future. We have our children to think of and all the health potential hazards that are associated with mercury. As a registered nurse myself I have tremendous concerns for that and I ask that you consider this site to be closed, to please consider a site that is not as densely populated as Hillsborough, and I thank you for listening.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you for coming. Now did I not see another hand? Please come up.

MRS. ZAKALUK: I am Marie Zakaluk. In addition to the fact that we are very populated I would like to add two other aspects. This community is one of the few places in the United States that is more than 200 years old, older than the United States itself. We have quite a heritage that could easily be destroyed. That's number one. American heritage no one has mentioned that. We love our children, we love our homes, but we also love our country. When we

CR-2

Commentor No. 100: Marie Zakaluk (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

1 think of a country as a whole this is a very,
2 very patriotic area. The brick in my home is
3 over 200 years old. It was used on sailing
4 vessels, and it came from Hillsborough. That's
5 number one, The historic City of Hillsborough is
6 at stake. I mentioned to someone else who had
7 not heard of Eugene O'Neill the playwrite, but
8 also the world traveler, he said he had traveled
9 the world and there was no more beautiful place
10 than the Sourland Mountains. History and beauty
11 can be destroyed in just a few minutes. Today I
12 walked through the Sourland mountains. They are
13 beautiful. I walked with someone who has walked
14 in Austria and other parts of the world and said
15 the same thing. This place is gorgeous, I didn't
16 know it existed. Perhaps you gentlemen, in all
17 your research, have not bothered to walk through
18 our Hillsborough. We still have a few farms left
19 here. My husband and I have seen 49 of the 50
20 states and every time we get back to East
21 Mountain Road not only because it is home, but
22 because it is tremendously beautiful. Thank you
23 very much.
24 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Is there anyone
25 else who would like to make a formal comment?

CR-2

LU-1

LU-1

Commentor No. 101: Hillsborough Police Department Chief Robert Gazaway (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting)

Page 30

Yes, sir, please.

MR. GAZAWAY: Robert Gazaway, G-a-z-a-w-a-y, Chief of Police in Hillsborough. I won't go over all the things about security in which are very important, and the things that have already been mentioned. However, one thing I don't hear is I hope they took into consideration that we have an international airport just a few miles away. We have a lot of air traffic certainly approaching that airport. We have a regional airport right in our own community. We have another regional airport just in the next community. We have had many minor small aircraft accidents over the years, but we had one very serious one a few years ago which crashed into a condo complex probably no more than two miles away from your mercury storage center. It would be my concern with all the commercial air traffic that that should not be overlooked. I wonder how that would compare with the other sites that are being considered. I would think when you take into consideration all the concerns that were brought up, the things that I mentioned I just can't help but wonder why the best practice wouldn't be to move the site

RA-1

DM-1

Esquire Deposition Services
1-800-247-8366

Commentor No. 101: Hillsborough Police Department Chief Robert Gazaway (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 31

somewhere else. And I think in business that's what we all aim for, the best practice and I just can't see how the best practice would be to leave it here. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. All right one more time. Is there anyone else who would like to speak? Please, sir.

MR. FITZPATRICK: My name is Tom Fitzpatrick. I am a Hillsborough resident. I am sorry I walked in late on your meeting. But it seems to me the government likes to complicate issues like this stock pile. Not only military bases you have around the country, but you have superfund sites in every state and all over the country that you have spent billions of dollars lining the grounds with liners to protect the soil that we have already paid for and we already have it that are in former industrial areas and populated areas. It would seem to be easier to move them over to there if the DOP didn't want to take it out. Why don't you, you know, be a hero and move the stuff out of populated areas. Make your careers sour. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Is there someone else who would like to speak? Yes, sir

DM-1 (cont'd.)

Esquire Deposition Services
1-800-247-8366

Commentor No. 102: Tom Fitzpatrick (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting)

1 somewhere else. And I think in business that's
2 what we all aim for, the best practice and I just
3 can't see how the best practice would be to leave
4 it here. Thank you.
5 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. All right
6 one more time. Is there anyone else who would
7 like to speak? Please, sir.
8 MR. FITZPATRICK: My name is Tom
9 Fitzpatrick. I am a Hillsborough resident. I am
10 sorry I walked in late on your meeting. But it
11 seems to me the government likes to complicate
12 issues like this stock pile. Not only military
13 bases you have around the country, but you have
14 superfund sites in every state and all over the
15 country that you have spent billions of dollars
16 lining the grounds with liners to protect the
17 soil that we have already paid for and we already
18 have it that are in former industrial areas and
19 populated areas. It would seem to be easier to
20 move them over to there if the DOP didn't want to
21 take it out. Why don't you, you know, be a hero
22 and move the stuff out of populated areas. Make
23 your careers sour. Thank you.
24 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Is there
25 someone else who would like to speak? Yes, sir

AE-1

Commentor No. 103: Dr. Edward Gosselin (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting)

in the back, please. Ma'am, I am sorry. I didn't see your hand. I apologize.

MR. GOSSELIN: I will make my comments brief. My name is doctor Edward Gosselin. I am a physician at Somerset Medical Center, have been there for over 10 years and practicing in the area for over 15 years. To give you an idea of the growth of New Jersey -- New Jersey as you know is one of the most -- the most densely populated states in the United States. We have some of the greatest number of super fund sites, greatest number of groundfill sites and Somerset Medical Center alone, our emergency department census has gone, when I started in 1994 to 18,000 visits per year now we are at 42,000 visits per year because Somerset and Hunterdon County have some of the highest growth and influx rates in the State of New Jersey. We are expected to go up to 65,000 within the next two years. It is an extraordinarily densely populated state. There is going to be increased growth. There are many other areas. If you did everything in your power to secure the site there will always be the possibility of whether terrorism or act of God that this could not be contained. I have worked

RA-1

Commentor No. 103: Dr. Edward Gosselin (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

with Hazmat teams and we are currently working on several things, several different issues that basically are off the headlines. This would be one more thing that would make it extremely difficult to contain in this area. The population is simply too dense. Everybody is worried about not in my backyard. But when you have a backyard of tens of thousands of people as opposed to a backyard of a few that has to be one of the major issues that's concerned. We have to get it somewhere where there is a much less dense population and much less chance of population growth in the future. RA-1

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Again my apologies, please.

MS. NORTON: Nancy Norton from Hillsborough. My question is I am sure that you have moved things from one place to another quite often. My question is how long will it take you to transport this stuff out of here?

MR. LAWSON: I don't know when you came in, but I said there will not be dialogue now, but in a few minutes after we have had our last speaker we will try to address these questions.

MS. NORTON: You have that on the list.

Commentor No. 104: Nancy Norton (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting)

with Hazmat teams and we are currently working on several things, several different issues that basically are off the headlines. This would be one more thing that would make it extremely difficult to contain in this area. The population is simply too dense. Everybody is worried about not in my backyard. But when you have a backyard of tens of thousands of people as opposed to a backyard of a few that has to be one of the major issues that's concerned. We have to get it somewhere where there is a much less dense population and much less chance of population growth in the future.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Again my apologies, please.

MS. NORTON: Nancy Norton from Hillsborough. My question is I am sure that you have moved things from one place to another quite often. My question is how long will it take you to transport this stuff out of here? RT-1

MR. LAWSON: I don't know when you came in, but I said there will not be dialogue now, but in a few minutes after we have had our last speaker we will try to address these questions.

MS. NORTON: You have that on the list.

Commentor No. 105: Gordon and Kay Smith

July 8, 2003

9514 Woodruff Ct
New Haven IN 46774

MM EIS, DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Rd, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

ATTN: Project Manager

We would like to encourage you to not consider New Haven, Indiana as the future home of the nation's stockpile of Mercury. We are a small community that has already suffered the harm of a toxic waste dump for the last two decades in our "back yard" and the ramifications that accompany that. It seems that there would be a better location in which to store this stockpile. AC-1

Thank you for this consideration.

Sincerely,

Gordon & Kay Smith

Gordon and Kay Smith

cc. Honorable, Mark Souder
Honorable, Mike Pence
Honorable, Richard G. Lugar
Honorable, Evan Bayh

Commentor No. 106: Nevada Department of Administration
Heather K. Elliott

KENNY C. GUINN
Governor

STATE OF NEVADA

JOHN P. COMEAUX
Director

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
209 E. Musser Street, Room 200
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4298
Fax (775) 684-0260
(775) 684-0209

July 7, 2003

Attention: Project Manager
MM EIS, DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Re: SAI NV # E2003-116

Project: Draft Human Health & Ecological Risk Assessment Report & Draft EIA for the Defense National Stockpile Center

Dear Project Manager:

Enclosed is a comment from the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection that was received after our previous letter to you concerning the above referenced report. These comments constitute the State Clearinghouse review of this proposal as per Executive Order 12372. Please address these comments or concerns in your final decision. If you have questions, please contact me at 684-0209.

Sincerely,

Heather K. Elliott

Heather K. Elliott
Nevada State Clearinghouse/SPOC

Commentor No. 106: Nevada Department of Administration
Heather K. Elliott (continued)

July 3, 2003

MEMORANDUM

TO: Heather Elliott, Department of Administration, Clearinghouse
FROM: Allen Biaggi, Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection
SUBJECT: Storage of Mercury, Hawthorne Army Ammunition Depot
DOD – Defense National Stockpile Center

The Department of Defense (Defense National Stockpile Center) has prepared a draft mercury management Environmental Impact Statement for the national stockpile of 4,436 metric tons of mercury.

For 50 years the mercury stockpile has been stored in New Jersey (2,617 mt), Ohio (563 mt), Indiana (557 mt) and Tennessee (699 mt). The DEIS is considering one site in the continental U.S. for long-term, consolidated storage. In addition to the above locations, Nevada, Utah, and New York are also being considered for the consolidation and storage.

Mercury is a naturally occurring metal found throughout the environment and is a recognized public health concern and a known neurotoxin. Mercury can accumulate in the food chain impacting aquatic biota, wildlife and humans. The World Health Organization is encouraging the minimization and elimination of the use of mercury because of its adverse impacts on public health. The world's stockpiles and indirect and direct production of mercury exceeds the demand. This makes the US stockpile's value questionable further supporting the contention that this action is ultimately long term permanent storage. AC-1

The Hawthorne Army Ammunition Depot is the site proposed in the DEIS in Nevada. **The State of Nevada is opposed the consolidation and storage of the strategic mercury stockpile anywhere in Nevada.** AC-2

This position is based upon the following:

1

Commentor No. 106: Nevada Department of Administration Heather K. Elliott (continued)

1. Nevada has contributed more than its fair share to national defense, security, waste disposal and land restrictions including:

- Yucca Mountain, which is proposed to be the nation's high-level nuclear waste disposal facility (77,000 tons).
- The federal government's low-level nuclear waste is disposed of at the Nevada Test Site (20 million cubic feet plus 4 million cu. ft. per year for 20 years).
- Over 900 nuclear devices have been detonated at the Test Site, contaminating soil and ground water.
- Currently, the DOD restricts the use of 44,000 square miles of Nevada's air space for military training and operational purposes. **AC-2 (cont'd.)**
- Under the restricted air space, bombing ranges and open detonation areas are contaminated with unexploded ordinance and are not likely to ever be cleaned up for public use.
- Munitions are stored at the Hawthorne Army Ammunition Depot until they are sold or become unstable or unusable. Some are demilitarized and others are open-detonated or open-burned on-site for disposal.
- Hazardous wastes from all over the US and some foreign countries are disposed of in Nevada. The state is also being considered by a number of private interests for the large-scale disposal of out of state municipal wastes.

2. Putting mercury in the inventory at Hawthorne adds to the long-term stewardship issues that the DOD and DOE have yet to adequately address in Nevada. The federal government's policy appears to be that Nevada is a wasteland for disposal and other undesirable activities. **EP-1**

3. The aquatic health of Walker Lake is a critical concern to Nevada. Placing the national strategic mercury stockpile in close proximity to this unique resource presents a very real environmental and public health threat. **WR-1 RE-1**

4. Due to the lack of market demand for mercury and the public health concerns associated with the heavy metal, continued storage should be viewed as a long-term endeavor leading to ultimate disposal. Stabilization or treatment for disposal is not feasible or economical at this time. Nevada should not be burdened with the ultimate treatment, storage and disposal of this material within its jurisdictional boundaries. **WM-1**

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and their incorporation into Nevada's response to the DEIS.

Commentor No. 107: David Young (Toole, Utah Public Meeting)

the record as exhibits to this meeting, in addition to the oral comments, and both are weighed equally by D.N.S.C..

The first speaker and the only speaker that I have signed up at this point is David Young. Mr. Young, yes, could I ask you to step to the microphone please, sir? And thank you for coming.

MR. YOUNG: Well, I didn't say I was going to speak, but I have a couple concerns.

Prior to the meeting, your people showed me around and I was presently -- anyway, and all my answers there, or all my answers for my questions were provided.

I have one other, right now, and that is, will there be any environmental -- any cooling of the buildings, any environmental stuff like that to keep the buildings cool because Mercury does evaporate? SB-2

Also, one comment. When talking to people about how the stuff is to be shipped and handled, they said, you know, as you've said, "Well, we've handled it for fifty years, we know how to do it." Comparing it with the spent fuel -- nuclear fuel that they plan to bring out, they have a very involved program and plan to ship it, and special railroad cars and DOE's done many tests on it. I don't see anything like that in your presentation. I'm not really concerned about it, but it RT-2

Commentor No. 107: David Young (Toole, Utah Public Meeting) (continued)

1 might give people a better feeling if you could say we
2 dropped it out of an airplane at 500 feet and nothing
3 happened, or we had it on the railroad tracks and let an
4 engine run into a semi-loaded and nothing happened. So,
5 that's about all I've got to say.
6 MR. LAWSON: Okay and thank you.
7 And if we have only a few speakers, it won't be too
8 many minutes before you may have answers to those
9 questions.
10 Is there anyone else who would like to make a formal
11 comment into the record at this point? It can be for,
12 against, or it could be just a neutral comment, if you
13 have any. Okay. If there are not any then it's my
14 discretion to call a recess right now, and we will do
15 that in just a minute.
16 As I said before, we will be here, probably open for
17 comments until at least 8:30 this evening. So, if any
18 of you decide that you would like to make a comment
19 based on questions or answers that you hear, you are
20 certainly welcome to do that. I also appreciate your
21 being here. I will formally close the hearing probably
22 at 8:30, but we'll recess until such time as I have
23 somebody else who would like to speak formally into the
24 record.
25 MR. RILEY: Can I answer his question?

RT-2 (cont'd.)

Commentor No. 108: New Haven City Council
Honorable Tom C. Lewandowski (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Management Environmental Impact Statement, and IDEM intends to provide additional comment, as appropriate, by the July deadline.

We at the Indiana Department of Environmental Management will continue to work with the residents of New Haven, Indiana's elected officials, and the Defense Logistics Agency to be involved with this process.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Tom Lewandowski. And he would be followed by John Bennett.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Thank you. My name is Tom C. Lewandowski. I'm a Third District city councilman in New Haven. I'm also president of the Northeast Indiana Central Labor Council and like many of the speakers who are here today bring a combination of perspectives to this discussion. I have also worked as a historian, so I want to add that to this discussion.

But, first, let me say that on behalf of the New Haven City Council that we have taken the -- we have enough mercury here we can take our own temperature, and we have concluded that we're very sick at the thought of having more mercury stored here, but let me bring these several perspectives together.

When we look at the logic of defense logistics, I

Commentor No. 108: New Haven City Council
Honorable Tom C. Lewandowski (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

1 think it is something that we have to look at very
2 carefully. Back in the pre-World War II era, the
3 United States was the arsenal for democracy according to
4 the FDR, and that was the logic behind the development of
5 the offices of Production Management, then during
6 World War II, the War Production Board, and right after
7 World War II, the Civilian Production Agency. The idea is
8 that if we were going to be the arsenal for democracy, we
9 needed the productive capacity and the resources to be
10 that arsenal for democracy.
11 And when the Casad facility became the storage depot
12 for so many strategic materials that we found out later
13 many of which were toxic such as mercury, there was
14 tremendous productive capacity in and around Northeast
15 Indiana. Many of us worked in defense industries or our
16 parents did or our grandparents did, but things have
17 changed. Things have changed dramatically.
18 We are no longer perceived as an arsenal for
19 democracy. In the last several decades, most of our
20 productive capacity or far too much of it has been
21 globalized. As our productive capacity is globalized,
22 that notion of the arsenal for democracy is no longer
23 logical.
24 What we have seen instead is that those assets for
25 production while they are globalized, the liabilities of

Commentor No. 108: New Haven City Council
Honorable Tom C. Lewandowski (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 11

those toxic materials are not globalized. They are globalized here in Allen County in New Haven. This is unacceptable. It is logic turned on its head.

We need to get the liability out of here. Whether it is moved to another site or sold, it needs to be gone. We need to have Casad, the New Haven Depot, made into an asset again whatever environmental liabilities are there. And I trust that other speakers will address those. I know they will. Those need to be remediated. AC-1 OS-5

Casad needs to become an asset for Allen County. It's a place where we can have real economic development and no longer a liability. And it starts with getting the mercury out of here and all other hazardous materials. SE-2

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is John Bennett. Is Mr. Bennett here? Mr. Bennett is not here. Maybe I should announce two people in advance.

Beverly Werling? Maybe three people in advance. If anybody sees them or knows if they are going to speak, please let me know.

Harold West. I have a "maybe" here. Mr. West.

And he would be followed by Karen Bedwell and then Edward Klotz.

MR. WEST: Thank you. I'm Harold West, president of the New Haven City Council representing District 2. I

Commentor No. 109: New Haven, Indiana, Mayor's Youth Advisory Council Alecia Martin (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

government said it isn't, you know, it won't hurt you. And you say this mercury is real safe here.

Well, these tests were conducted. And radiation clouds, they drifted down to St. George, Utah. And the people from Washington came down and said don't worry, it won't hurt you a bit. And they went back to Washington. And, you know, years later people dropped dead just like flies. And I just wonder, I guess I just don't trust the government.

MR. LAWSON: Alecia Martin. And Ms. Martin is the last person I have on my list. After she speaks, I will go through the ones that I called who did not respond, and then I will ask if there is anybody else here who would like to speak.

MS. MARTIN: My name is Alecia Martin. I'm the vice chairman of the Mayor's Youth Advisory Council.

Mercury is the second most toxic element on earth next to plutonium. The amount of mercury found in one mercury thermometer is enough to pollute a small lake. This means if you bring the nation's mercury here and it accidentally is spilled, the entire ecosystem of New Haven and its surrounding neighbors will be severely diminished. RE-2

Mercury vapor is odorless, colorless, and very toxic. Even though liquid mercury evaporates slowly, a significant amount of mercury vapor can build up in the RA-1

Commentor No. 109: New Haven, Indiana, Mayor's Youth Advisory Council Alecia Martin (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 42

air after some has spilled and it can be very dangerous to breathe. There is always the chance that the mercury will get into the environment and everyone's health is endangered. RA-1 (cont'd.)

Breathing mercury vapors has been proven to cause damage to nervous, digestive, and respiratory systems. Initial exposure of the mercury produces symptoms like fatigue, fever, chills, coughing, a shortness of breath, tightness and burning pain in the chest, and inflammation of the lungs. Coughing up blood, impaired lung function, and inflammation of the lungs and potentially life-threatening accumulation of fluid in the lungs has occurred in the most severe cases.

Several cases have reported tremors, emotional instability including irritability, excessive shyness, loss of confidence and nervousness, sleeplessness, memory loss, muscle weakness, headaches, slow reflexes, and a loss of feeling or numbness. Kidney injury is common following exposure also. Reported effects range from increased protein in the urine to kidney failure to increased blood pressure and heart rate.

I hope some of these things I have said changed your mind a little bit about bringing the mercury to New Haven. Unless you, the citizens of New Haven, want a bunch of coughing people that can't eat or breathe, that are AC-1

Commentor No. 109: New Haven, Indiana, Mayor's Youth Advisory Council Alecia Martin (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 43

irritable with bad kidneys and don't -- just don't let the mercury come into New Haven. AC-1 (cont'd.)

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. Let me just review the list in case somebody has come back. John Bennett, Beverly Werling, Ed Garren, Tom Johnson, Dale or Joan Hermann, Don Markley, Dave Gilbert, Rick Tinney.

And I see a person here who would like to speak. Go ahead, sir.

MR. MCDONALD: Terry McDonald, mayor of New Haven. For the record, I registered via telephone and in front on the registration card. Is there anyone else that registered via telephone and didn't get called either? Is there anyone else? Okay.

MR. LAWSON: We will get you all.

MR. MCDONALD: Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposal to stockpile at one consolidated location the mercury in the DNSC inventory.

The City of New Haven is opposed to any consolidation of mercury or any other materials at the New Haven Depot. Although the DNSC has in recent years invested taxpayers' dollars in the New Haven Depot in their efforts to update the facility, the fact remains the New Haven Depot is an old facility that was slated for closure.

Esquire Deposition Services D.C - 1-800-441-3376 MD - 1-800-539-6398

Commentor No. 110: Honorable Mark E. Souder (U.S. House of Representatives), Represented by Mark Wickershaun (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 5

record. This will help the court reporter make an accurate record.

Remember the time limits. I have a clock so I can remind you gently. If you are approaching that time limit, I will ask you to summarize your remaining comments as quickly, yet as gracefully as possible. Please state your name, address, and organizational affiliation, if any, if you wish.

If you have a written copy of your testimony or if you have a written document you would like to submit, please bring it to me after you have spoken.

Written materials will be formally accepted into the record as exhibits to this hearing in addition to the oral comments. Both are weighed equally by DNSC.

All right. We're ready to begin. And the first speaker that you have on my list is Mark Wickershaun, and he will be speaking on behalf of Congressman Souder. And second to speak will be Paula M. Smith.

Mr. Wickershaun.

MR. WICKERSHAUN: Thank you, and good evening. I appreciate the opportunity and thank you all for coming this evening to this very important public hearing. Congressman Souder is in Washington as the House is in session this evening and asked me to extend the following comments.

Commentor No. 110: Honorable Mark E. Souder (U.S. House of Representatives), Represented by Mark Wickershaun (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 6

I appreciate the opportunity to share my views on the New Haven Depot with you this evening. I have met with representatives of the Defense Logistics Agency/Defense National Stockpile and informed them of my strong opposition to the dumping of mercury in New Haven. AC-1

Moving our nation's 4,800-ton mercury stockpile into the New Haven Depot is not a viable option. When I visited the depot, the Defense Logistics Agency confirmed with me that there had been two minor leakage problems in New Haven's history, and while the Casad facility has a good safety record, any spillage of such a dangerous substance as mercury is intolerable, especially in an urban environment. For this reason, I do not believe it is fair to subject a thriving community to this SB-3

potentially dangerous situation. Not only would the storage of our nation's mercury be a potential environmental threat, it would also put New Haven on the map as a potential terrorist target. RA-1

The residents of New Haven have been subjected to the importation of hazardous waste materials in the past. I supported the efforts of then-Mayor Shaw and "DumpStoppers" to stop the dumping of chemical waste in New Haven. Unless we cut the mercury problem off at the head, the Defense Department could use this consolidation as a gateway to bring in other hazardous materials. We in OS-3

Commentor No. 110: Honorable Mark E. Souder (U.S. House of Representatives), Represented by Mark Wickershaun (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 7

Indiana are tired of being perceived as a dumping ground for other people's waste and dangerous materials.

In my view, basic logic would suggest that if the potential for leakage exists, it is unwise to place storage facilities in urban areas. If the Defense Logistics Agency decides to consolidate the mercury, it should choose a more sparsely populated location. AC-1

Designating New Haven as the home to our nation's mercury stockpile would amount to a "Keep Out" sign to all prospective new businesses looking to make New Haven potentially their home. SE-2

In April, I pledged to the people of New Haven to do everything in my power to block the consolidation of mercury at the New Haven Depot. Tonight I am reaffirming this pledge, and I will work with Senators Lugar and Bayh to keep this from happening. New Haven is a thriving community, and I will continue to work hard to make sure that it stays that way. AC-1

Sincerely, Mark Souder, member of Congress.

MR. LAWSON: Great. Thank you, sir. I appreciate you coming and recognize your need to leave.

Our second speaker is Paula M. Smith, and Ms. Smith will be followed by Tom Lewandowski.

Please.

MS. SMITH: Thank you. Paula Smith, Indiana

Commentor No. 111: Indiana Department of Environmental Management Paula Smith (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 7

Indiana are tired of being perceived as a dumping ground for other people's waste and dangerous materials.

In my view, basic logic would suggest that if the potential for leakage exists, it is unwise to place storage facilities in urban areas. If the Defense Logistics Agency decides to consolidate the mercury, it should choose a more sparsely populated location. Designating New Haven as the home to our nation's mercury stockpile would amount to a "Keep Out" sign to all prospective new businesses looking to make New Haven potentially their home.

In April, I pledged to the people of New Haven to do everything in my power to block the consolidation of mercury at the New Haven Depot. Tonight I am reaffirming this pledge, and I will work with Senators Lugar and Bayh to keep this from happening. New Haven is a thriving community, and I will continue to work hard to make sure that it stays that way.

Sincerely, Mark Souder, member of Congress.

MR. LAWSON: Great. Thank you, sir. I appreciate you coming and recognize your need to leave.

Our second speaker is Paula M. Smith, and Ms. Smith will be followed by Tom Lewandowski.

Please.

MS. SMITH: Thank you. Paula Smith, Indiana

Commentor No. 111: Indiana Department of Environmental Management Paula Smith (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 8

Department of Environmental Management. And I'm here on behalf of the Indiana Department of Environmental Management's commissioner, Lori Kaplan, who is unable to be here this evening.

I will read an excerpt from a letter sent to Administrator Holder at the Defense Logistics Agency dated April 23, 2003, from Commissioner Kaplan.

Although the commissioner notes that the draft study -- the draft summary states the option to sell mercury was considered, but eliminated, from detailed study, Commissioner Kaplan would like to state that Indiana does not support the idea of selling the mercury. AS-1

We do not completely oppose the proposal to maintain the mercury stockpiles in their current storage locations. She recently visited the New Haven Depot in New Haven, Indiana, and she was impressed with the safety parameters and level of precaution that is being taken at the storage facility. AN-1

At this time, however, the agency agrees that the preferred alternative is to consolidate all mercury stockpiles for safe storage at another central location. AC-1

In addition to sharing these initial policy comments, the Indiana Department of Environmental Management technical staff is currently conducting an in-depth evaluation of the technical aspects of the Draft Mercury

Commentor No. 112: New Haven City Council
Honorable Harold West (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 11

those toxic materials are not globalized. They are globalized here in Allen County in New Haven. This is unacceptable. It is logic turned on its head.

We need to get the liability out of here. Whether it is moved to another site or sold, it needs to be gone. We need to have Casad, the New Haven Depot, made into an asset again whatever environmental liabilities are there. And I trust that other speakers will address those. I know they will. Those need to be remediated.

Casad needs to become an asset for Allen County. It's a place where we can have real economic development and no longer a liability. And it starts with getting the mercury out of here and all other hazardous materials.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is John Bennett. Is Mr. Bennett here? Mr. Bennett is not here. Maybe I should announce two people in advance.

Beverly Werling? Maybe three people in advance. If anybody sees them or knows if they are going to speak, please let me know.

Harold West. I have a "maybe" here. Mr. West.

And he would be followed by Karen Bedwell and then Edward Klotz.

MR. WEST: Thank you. I'm Harold West, president of the New Haven City Council representing District 2. I

Commentor No. 112: New Haven City Council
Honorable Harold West (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

didn't sign up to speak. I didn't think I did, but I'll be glad to come up anyhow and add my comments.

Some of the materials that I have seen tonight in reference to soil samples around the Casad Depot are a little bit of a concern to me. We have knowledge that there has been some mercury leakage. And one has to think about some of the other areas you said would welcome or at least indicated they had no objection to mercury being brought there, more sparsely populated areas. SB-3

I wonder about the -- what the impact of a catastrophic event might be. And I know that those areas you have talked about in Utah and Nevada, probably if we would put our tornadic activity record against theirs, and you realize that this is a pretty serious event if we had a major tornado, what kind of impact would it have in your facility. RA-1

We haven't had the misfortune of a major earthquake, but I have also been told that there is a major fault line that runs through Indiana and we have that capacity to have a major earthquake at some time. Those are issues that need to be looked at as well.

And again, in looking at the Army Corp of Engineers' reports that I have seen tonight, there is already an excessive amount of materials in there that could get into our water supplies. I think the materials that are there SB-3 AC-1

Commentor No. 112: New Haven City Council
Honorable Harold West (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 13

are best put in the middle of the desert in a sparsely populated area and not in Allen County. AC-1 (cont'd.)

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir.

Karen Bedwell. And before you get started, Edward Klotz would be next to be followed by Ed Garren.

Please.

MS. BEDWELL: Karen Bedwell, 11525 Edgerton Road, New Haven, a property owner.

And I am really getting tired of being referred to as a "Nimby." If this is all so safe and carries no depreciation to our property values, then let's find an empty warehouse out in Coventry and have a guard watch the mercury out there while it sits in their back yards.

This is not an issue of New Haven being the best and most economical area to place the mercury, it is an issue of what is best for the economic development of East Allen County. We must not allow ourselves to become the low income suburb of Fort Wayne. We have our share of problem areas, and we do not need to be further blighted.

Many of us have chosen to put our life energies in developing our homes to be our special havens, and it is not right to sit back and willingly let our property values be affected. Many areas are completely residential, and we did nothing to deserve to have further

Commentor No. 113: Karen Bedwell (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 13

are best put in the middle of the desert in a sparsely populated area and not in Allen County.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir.

Karen Bedwell. And before you get started, Edward Klotz would be next to be followed by Ed Garren.

Please.

MS. BEDWELL: Karen Bedwell, 11525 Edgerton Road, New Haven, a property owner.

And I am really getting tired of being referred to as a "Nimby." If this is all so safe and carries no depreciation to our property values, then let's find an empty warehouse out in Coventry and have a guard watch the mercury out there while it sits in their back yards.

This is not an issue of New Haven being the best and most economical area to place the mercury, it is an issue of what is best for the economic development of East Allen County. We must not allow ourselves to become the low income suburb of Fort Wayne. We have our share of problem areas, and we do not need to be further blighted. SE-2

Many of us have chosen to put our life energies in developing our homes to be our special havens, and it is not right to sit back and willingly let our property values be affected. Many areas are completely residential, and we did nothing to deserve to have further

Commentor No. 113: Karen Bedwell (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 14

mercury head our way for storage.

The mercury will bring no economic growth to our area, and I strongly question the safety issues. Who is to say a natural disaster as some others have already referred to or even someone might decide to bomb the Casad Depot. The future and people's actions are many times out of control. RA-1

I was listening to Pat White tonight, and he was discussing that New Haven is the least costly location to store this waste. Why would the cost be only $20 million here and $60 million in other areas? Why would the CB-1

population of the area to be -- why wouldn't the population of the area be the biggest factor to consider for the mercury placement? DM-2

What happens when the Mercury needs to be moved and disposed of? Can it ever be disposed? DD-1 AE-2

What are the uses of the mercury and what is the demand for it? Who wants it and what can it be used for? PN-2

I was of the understanding this depot is to be closed in the near future. Is it? And, if so, when and where does the mercury get moved to after we've suffered economic loss to our property values? PN-1

Think further ahead and plan long-term and do away with a short-term fix for a long-term loss.

It's imperative to make your thoughts and concerns

Esquire Deposition Services D.C - 1-800-441-3376 MD - 1-800-539-6398

Commentor No. 113: Karen Bedwell (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 15

1 known, so everyone that is here needs to talk with their
2 friends, relatives, and neighbors and make those concerns
3 known. Notify in writing to the National Stockpile
4 Center. I urge everyone to contribute your comments and
5 send copies to your legislators.
6 Right here, New Haven has passed a legislation that
7 they are strongly opposing this. They do have the names
8 and addresses for all of the legislators that you do need
9 to contact. So if you didn't get this this evening, pick
10 one up from City Hall. And we as citizens banding
11 together can make a big difference. Be sure and write
12 your letters.
13 MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Thank you.
14 Our next speaker would be Edward Klotz.
15 MR. KLOTZ: My name is Edward Klotz.
16 MR. LAWSON: Just one second. I have to give the
17 next person a warning. The next one would be Ed Garren to
18 be followed by Ron Oetting.
19 Please.
20 MR. KLOTZ: My name is Edward Klotz. I just want to
21 thank everybody that is here for showing up. It is kind
22 of like the hazardous waste dump. Nobody is, you know,
23 it's too bad with all of the advertisement here that this
24 whole room isn't filled with people that are standing out
25 in the hallway, because everybody I have seen I think

Commentor No. 114: Edward Klotz (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 15

1 known, so everyone that is here needs to talk with their
2 friends, relatives, and neighbors and make those concerns
3 known. Notify in writing to the National Stockpile
4 Center. I urge everyone to contribute your comments and
5 send copies to your legislators.
6 Right here, New Haven has passed a legislation that
7 they are strongly opposing this. They do have the names
8 and addresses for all of the legislators that you do need
9 to contact. So if you didn't get this this evening, pick
10 one up from City Hall. And we as citizens banding
11 together can make a big difference. Be sure and write
12 your letters.
13 MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Thank you.
14 Our next speaker would be Edward Klotz.
15 MR. KLOTZ: My name is Edward Klotz.
16 MR. LAWSON: Just one second. I have to give the
17 next person a warning. The next one would be Ed Garren to
18 be followed by Ron Oetting.
19 Please.
20 MR. KLOTZ: My name is Edward Klotz. I just want to
21 thank everybody that is here for showing up. It is kind
22 of like the hazardous waste dump. Nobody is, you know,
23 it's too bad with all of the advertisement here that this
24 whole room isn't filled with people that are standing out
25 in the hallway, because everybody I have seen I think

Esquire Deposition Services

D.C - 1-800-441-3376
MD - 1-800-539-6398

Commentor No. 114: Edward Klotz (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 16

1 waits too late, you know, before they get involved.
2 The next comment is I don't really know why we are
3 having this meeting, because I read in the newspaper where AC-1
4 somebody wants this mercury, so let them have it, you
5 know, give it to them.
6 The other thing is the potential for leaks. I was
7 reading the studies, and evidently there is already SB-3
8 leakage of lead and mercury in the ground there, so it
9 must not be that safe. And as far as epoxy on a concrete
10 floor, if there is a major spill, that isn't going to do
11 very much.
12 I know my cousin built a facility making racing oil,
13 and they made him make a concrete pit so that if there is
14 leakage that it will contain all of the spill. And I SB-1
15 doubt, you know, I would be interested to know if there is
16 some kind of a retention concrete, you know, retention
17 pond or whatever you want to call it there in the
18 facility.
19 My concerns are the leakage and the contamination
20 that is already there. Thank you.
21 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir.
22 The next speaker is Ed Garren. Is Mr. Garren here?
23 Then Ron Oetting. Following Mr. Oetting -- let me go
24 back. Has John Bennett arrived or perhaps Beverly
25 Werling?

Commentor No. 115: New Haven Chamber of Commerce
Ron Oetting (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 17

Okay. Mr. Oetting, please.

MR. OETTING: I'm Ron Oetting, O-e-t-t-i-n-g, president of the New Haven Chamber of Commerce.

MR. LAWSON: I'd ask you just to speak up just a little louder, please.

MR. OETTING: P.O. Box 66 in New Haven. I would like to read a letter from our Chamber Board of Directors, first the mission statement, "The New Haven Chamber of Commerce is dedicated to encouraging the continued growth of the greater New Haven area through support of successful business and civic activities that enhance the quality of life for the family."

That mission statement clearly reflects its membership's interests in the inherent principles of free enterprise, but just as clearly expects businesses to assume a stake in the prosperity of the community, the safety of our citizenry, and responsible consideration for our environment.

The Chamber's Board of Directors has been elected to speak for the Chamber membership regarding any issues that the Board feels are in the best interests of its members and the community-at-large.

That being the case, the New Haven Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors hereby publicly proclaims its opposition to the continued use of the New Haven Depot as AC-1

Commentor No. 115: New Haven Chamber of Commerce
Ron Oetting (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)
(continued)

Page 18

a depository for massive amounts of mercury and soundly opposes additional quantities being amassed. We would strongly encourage the United States Government to use other areas which as less densely populated and removed from any influx of residences, schools, businesses, and other community venues. AC-1 (cont'd.)

Innovative leadership and fresh vision from our current City administration and our City Council promises a proud and prosperous future for our business community and our citizens. The Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors views this mercury storage depository as both being insalubrious for the city's image and diametrically opposed to the quality of life the majority of our taxpayers prefer. We join Mayor Terry McDonald, City administrators, and City Council members in opposing the consolidation of the national mercury stockpile in New Haven. AC-1

With new housing development, a downtown revitalization program underway, and considerable commercial growth opportunity, New Haven needs to shed this image that it's had for far too long, that of a "dumping grounds" for everyone else's waste materials.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Do you want to submit that? Thank you.

Commentor No. 116: John Brown (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 23

1 begin. The Defense Department will not be held
2 responsible for cleanup efforts as long as the storage
3 portion of the Casad remains active.
4 Please write your congressmen and your senators
5 telling them your thoughts and opinions. Please take into
6 consideration the value of the property in the City of
7 New Haven and Woodburn. If New Haven becomes the single
8 designated site for all the mercury in the United States,
9 could you imagine the detrimental effect this would have
10 on the average homeowner in these cities? Could you
11 imagine New Haven becoming a ghost town? We have to stand
12 up to this together.
13 Thank you.
14 MR. LAWSON: Thank you.
15 Tom Johnson. Is Mr. Johnson here?
16 John and Berenice Brown?
17 I have another Paula Smith. Is there a second Paula
18 Smith? And then a Dale and Joan Hermann who would be
19 next.
20 So this must be John and Berenice Brown. Thank you
21 for coming.
22 MR. BROWN: I signed up because I knew she would have
23 something to say, so I'm going to rely on her saying it.
24 I do have a question first. And I would like to know if
25 our federal government is still procuring mercury. We

PN-2

Commentor No. 116: John Brown (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 24

PN-2 (cont'd.)

can't figure out what to do with what we've got. Are we still buying it and storing it?

MR. HOLDER: I'll answer that right now. No, we are not. As far as the Defense National Stockpile Center, no, we are not procuring any mercury.

MR. BROWN: Good. I figured we probably were. I'm glad to hear we're not.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. Please continue.

MS. BROWN: My name is Berenice Brown, and I live one mile from the Casad. We have lived out there for 39 years. And my concern is the leakage. I know it leaked before. And what happens if they bring the 4,400 ton in here and there is a major leak into the ground, leaching into the ground, and I don't like that idea.

And the idea that you say this is a secure site, I know for a fact that I took my son out there in 1975, and I was able to pull in past the guard, but I had to turn around, but I left my son out there with several other boys who worked out there tearing up pallets. And they worked on the grounds. Any one of those boys could have gotten into that mercury warehouse I'm sure because they were on the grounds. So it is not as secure as is said.

And I'm just wondering what the government is going to do in upgrading if they bring this mercury in, upgrading our road systems to support these trucks coming

Commentor No. 117: Berenice Brown (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

can't figure out what to do with what we've got. Are we still buying it and storing it?

MR. HOLDER: I'll answer that right now. No, we are not. As far as the Defense National Stockpile Center, no, we are not procuring any mercury.

MR. BROWN: Good. I figured we probably were. I'm glad to hear we're not.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. Please continue.

MS. BROWN: My name is Berenice Brown, and I live one mile from the Casad. We have lived out there for 39 years. And my concern is the leakage. I know it leaked before. And what happens if they bring the 4,400 ton in here and there is a major leak into the ground, leaching into the ground, and I don't like that idea. RA-1

And the idea that you say this is a secure site, I know for a fact that I took my son out there in 1975, and I was able to pull in past the guard, but I had to turn around, but I left my son out there with several other boys who worked out there tearing up pallets. And they worked on the grounds. Any one of those boys could have gotten into that mercury warehouse I'm sure because they were on the grounds. So it is not as secure as is said. SB-1

And I'm just wondering what the government is going to do in upgrading if they bring this mercury in, upgrading our road systems to support these trucks coming RT-1

Commentor No. 117: Berenice Brown (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 25

in. They can't do it on -- I live on dirt roads. I have
been on dirt roads 39 years in this county. And they
can't support semis coming down those roads. RT-1 (cont'd.)

And I just think that if someone wants this mercury,
let them have it. We don't need it here contaminating our
waterway out there. There is people that go out there and
fish and camp. We don't even know if it has already
leached into the lake. RA-1

A tornado hit years ago right out there. What if it
had hit the warehouse instead of the lake? RA-3

So I think that the plans are for it to go someplace
else rather than New Haven, and it should. AC-1 In a populated
county such as ours, we don't need it when Utah wants it
and they only have a population in their county of
5,800 and some, so why would you put it in a dense
population like this. DM-2

What is it going to do to the growth of the east end
of New Haven growing out towards Ohio? People are not
going to want to come in when they know that there is a
potential threat in the area at all times of this mercury,
something happening to it. So I think we just have to
fight this off as much as we can when you have got other
places to put it. SE-2

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

Commentor No. 118: Jefferson Township
Ron Hakes (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 26

All right. Do we have a Dale and Joan Hermann?
If not, we have Harold and Jean Franke.
MR. FRANKE: That was an error.
MR. LAWSON: Pardon me?
MR. FRANKE: That was an error.
MR. LAWSON: It was an error. Okay. Thank you.
Ron Hakes. Following Mr. Hakes would be Ty Mansfield and Don Markley.
Mr. Hakes, please.
MR. HAKES: I didn't really put down anything to talk, but I guess I will. Everybody else is, so I will give you my opinion.
My name is Ron Hakes. I'm a trustee of Jefferson Township where the depot is located at. And it's too bad this many people didn't show up at the dump meeting last month, because we had 1,400 signatures to take up there, and that didn't do any good, so now I would like to plead to you people that these papers that these folks gave you to fill out and make your comments, we need about 14,000 of those. So take them home, copy and give them to ten people and have them sign it and maybe with any luck at all if the mayor works hard at it, we might get 50,000. I don't know.
But my other comment I would like to make is the vandals, the way they do things now, if they go in there

SB-1

Commentor No. 118: Jefferson Township
Ron Hakes (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 27

and tear up those barrels, and if we get more of that stuff, there will be that much more stuff in the dump, and I really don't think we need that so I think we ought to send it to Utah. If they want it, they can have it. SB-1 (cont'd.)

They were talking about closing the Casad in the year 2015 if I'm correct, or tell me if I'm wrong, but I don't think I am, so why would you bring this stuff in here now and have to move it in 12 more years and take the possibility of wrecking the trains and all that stuff. PN-1

Another comment, if you think these chemicals are not bad, I retired out at Goodrich, and I put in over 30 years unloading these chemicals. And I averaged about one or two days in the hospital every year. I can't hardly breathe. When I leave this meeting tonight and I have to walk uphill, I might have to have help to get up to my truck. This is what these chemicals and stuff do to you. If you think I'm lying, just follow me around for a whole day. It wouldn't be hard for you, because I can't move very fast anymore.

Make sure you take these papers home and fill them out and make copies for other people to sign and send them all in.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir.

Our next speaker would be Ty Mansfield. Is Mr. Mansfield here?

Commentor No. 119: Tyler Mansfield (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 28

He'll be followed by Don Markley and Paul Taylor.

MR. MANSFIELD: Hello. I'm Tyler Mansfield. I would just like to say, I would like to know if anyone here is actually qualified or, you know, is a scientist and they can actually analyze the data that they have been presented with, just a question.

And really does anybody here, I mean, how many of you actually know what the effects of exposure to mercury is? I mean, really, are you scientifically equipped to analyze this kind of information?

Sure. I understand from an economic standpoint that it may cause some effects, but really do you economically know what it will do? I mean, have you been presented with the right amount of information? So you really should get enough information before you make a decision. Just don't go making decisions blindly. SE-1

And if somebody else wants to take this waste, sure, send it somewhere else if it is going to cause you problems like even living by it, sure, send it away, but don't try to dump things out in the desert. It really isn't a quality solution for our problems. AC-1

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: Paul Taylor, 3811 Knollcrest Road.

MR. LAWSON: Just one second. Is this Paul Taylor? You're Paul Taylor?

Commentor No. 120: Paul Taylor (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

He'll be followed by Don Markley and Paul Taylor.

MR. MANSFIELD: Hello. I'm Tyler Mansfield. I would just like to say, I would like to know if anyone here is actually qualified or, you know, is a scientist and they can actually analyze the data that they have been presented with, just a question.

And really does anybody here, I mean, how many of you actually know what the effects of exposure to mercury is? I mean, really, are you scientifically equipped to analyze this kind of information?

Sure. I understand from an economic standpoint that it may cause some effects, but really do you economically know what it will do? I mean, have you been presented with the right amount of information? So you really should get enough information before you make a decision. Just don't go making decisions blindly.

And if somebody else wants to take this waste, sure, send it somewhere else if it is going to cause you problems like even living by it, sure, send it away, but don't try to dump things out in the desert. It really isn't a quality solution for our problems.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: Paul Taylor, 3811 Knollcrest Road.

MR. LAWSON: Just one second. Is this Paul Taylor? You're Paul Taylor?

Commentor No. 120: Paul Taylor (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Okay. I assume that Don Markley, is Don Markley here? No.

Then Mr. Taylor will speak followed by Mark Bruick and then Ed Rousseau.

Mr. Taylor, please.

MR. TAYLOR: 3811 Knollcrest Road, Fort Wayne.

The last speaker asked the question how many of you know about mercury. I know firsthand. For the last two years, I have been receiving chelation treatment for excessive lead and mercury poisoning. When they ran the heavy metals test, it about went off the page.

I was to the point to where when I stood up, it was like I was drunk. I didn't have balance. I could not think. I could not construct a sentence, carry on a conversation. I was unable to work. I had chest pains and respiratory problems, headaches for 2 1/2 years nonstop, bowel problems. You name it.

And I listened to doctors say that there was nothing wrong. I went to neurologists, heart doctors, respiratory doctors. They couldn't find the problem. Mercury poisoning is massive stuff. I know.

But that isn't the real No. 1 issue for me believe it or not. I'm looking at this from another standpoint to which I haven't heard anybody even address. The concept of the Casad Depot and these other depots was to stockpile

Commentor No. 120: Paul Taylor (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

1 necessary raw materials in the event of a war or some
2 catastrophic event that our nation would have the
3 capability to readily assemble things and to move forward
4 to protect this country.
5 To go and place all of one type of resource in one
6 location to me does not make any sense at all. I realize
7 that at this point everybody is using less and less
8 mercury. I am an electrician by trade, and I have been
9 around a lot of mercury in and out of factories and
10 commercial and industrial installations. I have had to
11 fill mercury switches. I know that we have lamps, mercury
12 made for lamps, your florescent lamps have mercury,
13 switches, thermostats in your homes. There is a lot of
14 things that have mercury in them.
15 And it's been a good item in a lot of ways, but like
16 it has been pointed out in the past, it has become -- it
17 is well-known that it is also very toxic if you get it in
18 your body.
19 My concern is in the event of a catastrophic event,
20 it would cause all of this to be possibly released in one
21 location. The old-timers said you don't put all your eggs
22 in one basket. For the newer people, that means you don't
23 buy all Enron stock, you don't put all your corporate
24 offices in the World Trade Center, and you don't put all
25 of your mercury in one location.

AC-1

AC-1

Commentor No. 120: Paul Taylor (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

To look at it from a national perspective as far as the security of the country, I see absolutely no sense in bringing any more mercury into New Haven. And if they are going to consolidate it anyplace, it should be in a place that is securer than the New Haven location, that is able to stand tornados, and at a location that has plenty of containment facilities on hand. AC-1 (cont'd.)

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

Okay. Our next speaker will be Mark Bruick to be followed by Ed Rousseau and Trevor Dewey.

MR. BRUICK: My name is Mark Bruick. I'm a resident, property owner, and business owner at 12818 Edgerton Road.

I have serious concerns about bringing more mercury into the area. In all of the Executive Summary we have here, I will just address the financial aspect. And one glaring thing I see is there is no great reason given to not putting this material on the market and liquidating it. We are going to shuffle it around at a cost of $25 to $65 million.

If you look in the summary, it says right in here, the value if we sell it on the market, we can bring in $25 million. Why are we jeopardizing communities?

I am very close, three quarters of a mile away, but just from an economic standpoint, it makes no sense at

Commentor No. 121: Mark Bruick (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 31

To look at it from a national perspective as far as the security of the country, I see absolutely no sense in bringing any more mercury into New Haven. And if they are going to consolidate it anyplace, it should be in a place that is securer than the New Haven location, that is able to stand tornados, and at a location that has plenty of containment facilities on hand.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

Okay. Our next speaker will be Mark Bruick to be followed by Ed Rousseau and Trevor Dewey.

MR. BRUICK: My name is Mark Bruick. I'm a resident, property owner, and business owner at 12818 Edgerton Road.

I have serious concerns about bringing more mercury into the area. In all of the Executive Summary we have here, I will just address the financial aspect. And one glaring thing I see is there is no great reason given to not putting this material on the market and liquidating it. We are going to shuffle it around at a cost of $25 to $65 million. AC-1

If you look in the summary, it says right in here, the value if we sell it on the market, we can bring in $25 million. Why are we jeopardizing communities? AS-1

I am very close, three quarters of a mile away, but just from an economic standpoint, it makes no sense at

Commentor No. 121: Mark Bruick (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 32

all. It needs to be explained further why this material cannot go on the market and this market is actively buying and selling at this point in time. If the EKN allows this material to be bought and sold, exported and imported, why can't we as U.S. citizens sell our material. AS-1 (cont'd.)

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

Your name, sir?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I'm Ed Rousseau, and I'm a county commissioner.

Approximately two years ago, I was standing over on that side over there, and being a Realtor and an appraiser, I made a statement such as that in all of the years I have been in the real estate business, I have never had anyone ever approach me and say I would like to have a nice little spot over by the hazardous waste dump, you know, to live. That situation is somewhat subdued at this point.

And then of course as a young man around nine, ten years old, my father I remember drove me by a place they were building, the Casad.

And my brother spent some time in the service during World War II. And I was in the service during the Korean War. And I say to myself, well, now, this community has participated I think about long enough in storing strategic materials. I don't think we need to do that

Commentor No. 122: Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen
Ed Rousseau (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 32

all. It needs to be explained further why this material cannot go on the market and this market is actively buying and selling at this point in time. If the EKN allows this material to be bought and sold, exported and imported, why can't we as U.S. citizens sell our material.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

Your name, sir?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I'm Ed Rousseau, and I'm a county commissioner.

Approximately two years ago, I was standing over on that side over there, and being a Realtor and an appraiser, I made a statement such as that in all of the years I have been in the real estate business, I have never had anyone ever approach me and say I would like to have a nice little spot over by the hazardous waste dump, you know, to live. That situation is somewhat subdued at this point.

And then of course as a young man around nine, ten years old, my father I remember drove me by a place they were building, the Casad.

And my brother spent some time in the service during World War II. And I was in the service during the Korean War. And I say to myself, well, now, this community has participated I think about long enough in storing strategic materials. I don't think we need to do that AC-1

Commentor No. 122: Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen
Ed Rousseau (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)
(continued)

Page 33

anymore.

And being my real profession as a Realtor or appraiser, I don't see that now that we know that there is mercury there, I did not know that, and now that we know that it's there, that doesn't necessarily add anything to the situation as far as our economic development. AC-1 (cont'd.) SE-2

Just a short time ago in the past few weeks, we have found that we have now some additional ground in this particular area that can be developed more and help our economic development. This community is working very hard for economic development.

And so I think at this point I would like to point out there is some 330,000 people that live in Allen County here, but the area is frequently pretty much probably about 500,000 people. And it would be our preference to oppose the Casad Depot and move this hazardous waste material now that we know it is here and move it where it would be less densely populated. AC-1

Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

All right. I have Trevor Dewey and then Dave Gilbert and Marla Irving.

MR. DEWEY: Hey there. My name is Trevor Dewey, and I'm new in New Haven. I haven't lived here all my life like some of you people, but I kind of want to make

Commentor No. 123: Trevor Dewey (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

anymore.

And being my real profession as a Realtor or appraiser, I don't see that now that we know that there is mercury there, I did not know that, and now that we know that it's there, that doesn't necessarily add anything to the situation as far as our economic development.

Just a short time ago in the past few weeks, we have found that we have now some additional ground in this particular area that can be developed more and help our economic development. This community is working very hard for economic development.

And so I think at this point I would like to point out there is some 330,000 people that live in Allen County here, but the area is frequently pretty much probably about 500,000 people. And it would be our preference to oppose the Casad Depot and move this hazardous waste material now that we know it is here and move it where it would be less densely populated.

Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

All right. I have Trevor Dewey and then Dave Gilbert and Marla Irving.

MR. DEWEY: Hey there. My name is Trevor Dewey, and I'm new in New Haven. I haven't lived here all my life like some of you people, but I kind of want to make

Commentor No. 123: Trevor Dewey (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 34

New Haven my home and aspiring eventually into business in computers and welding technology.

I'm not looking forward to the mercury being stored here at all. It has kind of got me a little disappointed. I thought this is a nice, quiet little town. I would like to make it my home. I got to know people around here, and they are very friendly.

I do know mercury in response to that one gentleman's question do we really know what mercury can do to you, well, from where I'm from, a family of five almost died.

What had happened was a little boy broke a thermometer full of mercury. And he tried to hide the fact from his mom. And his mom was vacuuming up the carpet one day, and somehow it got into the air. There were no filters in the vacuum cleaner. Well, the whole family got sick and they didn't know what was wrong with them.

So when it gets into the air, obviously it is very dangerous. I'm not sure how safe of a facility you have over here, but if anything goes wrong, it is going to go wrong big. And that's a lot of mercury. And one of the questions I kind of have is why do we need so many voices to debate this? I mean, can't we just use common sense? It is bad stuff. Nobody wants it around. That's all. RA-1 AC-1

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much.

Esquire Deposition Services D.C - 1-800-441-3376 MD - 1-800-539-6398

Commentor No. 124: Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen
Marla Irving (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 35

Dave Gilbert?

Marla Irving?

Christina Adkinson. No or yes? I see a "maybe" here.

MS. IRVING: Good evening. My name is Marla Irving. I'm a county commissioner. And my partner here, he got here before I did. He's always Johnny on the spot, and I didn't know he already signed up.

All I would like to do is reiterate again, the County Commissioners sent a letter, I believe we were the first ones who sent a letter, and we make sure that we represent 330,000 to 337,000 people in this community. And this community is against. AC-1

I'm on the Department of Planning Commission, and we're working hard. We work with Mayor McDonald consistently. We are trying to get economic development to draw manufacturing into this, businesses, high tech jobs. And when you continually try to make any of Allen County a dumping ground for this area, it just sets us back again. And it's hard to attract new business when you are constantly saying, well, we're going to dump here, we're going to bring hazardous waste, we're going to have mercury here. SE-2

And so from the bottom of my heart I'm begging you, if you've got two communities that are welcoming you AC-1

Commentor No. 124: Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen Marla Irving (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 36

there, take advantage of it. AC-1 (cont'd.)

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. Thanks.

Christina Atkinson to be followed by John Bedwell and Terry and Carolyn Werling.

MS. ATKINSON: I don't know any facts or figures, but I do know mercury is not good for you. And I also know I'm a wife, a mother, and I don't want this, you know, I don't want to live in a place where you have mercury and you have a threat that something bad can happen where you live at. It is really sad. This is a nice community.

And I'm like that other man. I just moved here recently three years from Auburn. And when this all came out, I was like oh, my gosh, this isn't right. This isn't good.

And I'm with everybody else. If someone else wants this, let them have it. You know, these are our lives, these are our homes as people. Why does it take so many people to say we don't want it? Can't one person be enough to say we don't want it here?

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

John Bedwell and to be followed by Carolyn and Terry Werling and Steve Loeschner.

MR. BEDWELL: I'm John Bedwell, 11525 Edgerton Road.

Commentor No. 125: Christina Atkinson (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 36

there, take advantage of it.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. Thanks.

Christina Atkinson to be followed by John Bedwell and Terry and Carolyn Werling.

MS. ATKINSON: I don't know any facts or figures, but I do know mercury is not good for you. And I also know I'm a wife, a mother, and I don't want this, you know, I don't want to live in a place where you have mercury and you have a threat that something bad can happen where you live at. It is really sad. This is a nice community. AC-1

And I'm like that other man. I just moved here recently three years from Auburn. And when this all came out, I was like oh, my gosh, this isn't right. This isn't good.

And I'm with everybody else. If someone else wants this, let them have it. You know, these are our lives, these are our homes as people. Why does it take so many people to say we don't want it? Can't one person be enough to say we don't want it here? AC-1

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

John Bedwell and to be followed by Carolyn and Terry Werling and Steve Loeschner.

MR. BEDWELL: I'm John Bedwell, 11525 Edgerton Road.

Commentor No. 126: John Bedwell (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

there, take advantage of it.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. Thanks.

Christina Atkinson to be followed by John Bedwell and Terry and Carolyn Werling.

MS. ATKINSON: I don't know any facts or figures, but I do know mercury is not good for you. And I also know I'm a wife, a mother, and I don't want this, you know, I don't want to live in a place where you have mercury and you have a threat that something bad can happen where you live at. It is really sad. This is a nice community.

And I'm like that other man. I just moved here recently three years from Auburn. And when this all came out, I was like oh, my gosh, this isn't right. This isn't good.

And I'm with everybody else. If someone else wants this, let them have it. You know, these are our lives, these are our homes as people. Why does it take so many people to say we don't want it? Can't one person be enough to say we don't want it here?

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

John Bedwell and to be followed by Carolyn and Terry Werling and Steve Loeschner.

MR. BEDWELL: I'm John Bedwell, 11525 Edgerton Road.

Commentor No. 126: John Bedwell (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 37

My wife has already spoke. I wasn't going to say too much, but I decided to come up. I appreciate all you people saying it. And I think a lot of things have been said tonight, but one thing hasn't been said, and I decided to come up because of that.

I don't know how many people even know that there is an underground river out there. What if there would be a catastrophe. If that gets in that river, all the wells from here to Ohio the other way would be affected. WR-1

And I think a lot of the things, the economics, the financial have already been said, so I'm not going to repeat it, but this is something that you may not have known. And if it does get into that river, we are in big trouble.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

All right. So is this Terry Werling?

MR. WERLING: Yes.

MR. LAWSON: Okay, Terry. Go ahead, please.

MR. WERLING: My name is Terry Werling. I live at 1705 Berwick Lane, New Haven. I'm a city councilman at large, City of New Haven.

My first home is on Berwick Lane. My second home is down at the City Administration Building. And I want everyone to understand and know that the City Council of

Commentor No. 127: City of New Haven
Honorable Terry Werling (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 37

My wife has already spoke. I wasn't going to say too much, but I decided to come up. I appreciate all you people saying it. And I think a lot of things have been said tonight, but one thing hasn't been said, and I decided to come up because of that.

I don't know how many people even know that there is an underground river out there. What if there would be a catastrophe. If that gets in that river, all the wells from here to Ohio the other way would be affected.

And I think a lot of the things, the economics, the financial have already been said, so I'm not going to repeat it, but this is something that you may not have known. And if it does get into that river, we are in big trouble.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

All right. So is this Terry Werling?

MR. WERLING: Yes.

MR. LAWSON: Okay, Terry. Go ahead, please.

MR. WERLING: My name is Terry Werling. I live at 1705 Berwick Lane, New Haven. I'm a city councilman at large, City of New Haven.

My first home is on Berwick Lane. My second home is down at the City Administration Building. And I want everyone to understand and know that the City Council of

Commentor No. 127: City of New Haven
Honorable Terry Werling (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 38

New Haven is opposing this.

Initially I wasn't planning on speaking here tonight. I heard about this several weeks ago, and the minute that I heard about it, everybody comes to me as a councilman and says Terry, what is going on? Why are we a dumping ground again? We just finished up one circumstance at the landfill. Here we are faced again with another situation.

Well, needless to say, enough is enough. We would like a huge favor from this organization to take this to someplace that wants it. We don't want it. AC-1

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

The next speaker would be Steve Loeschner.

And is Rick Tinney here? I have Rick Tinney and I have Rick Kinney. I don't know if they are supposed to be one in the same.

Mr. Loeschner, please.

MR. LOESCHNER: Steve Loeschner.

First of all, to get Mr. Holder warmed up here, I would like to know what has been done in the way of studies of the potential disasters at the New Haven Depot as far as the 400 tons that are there.

About the only natural disasters I see would be earthquake and tornado. And I would see those potentially causing the roof beams to fail, and depending upon where

Commentor No. 128: Steve Loeschner (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

New Haven is opposing this.

Initially I wasn't planning on speaking here tonight. I heard about this several weeks ago, and the minute that I heard about it, everybody comes to me as a councilman and says Terry, what is going on? Why are we a dumping ground again? We just finished up one circumstance at the landfill. Here we are faced again with another situation.

Well, needless to say, enough is enough. We would like a huge favor from this organization to take this to someplace that wants it. We don't want it.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

The next speaker would be Steve Loeschner.

And is Rick Tinney here? I have Rick Tinney and I have Rick Kinney. I don't know if they are supposed to be one in the same.

Mr. Loeschner, please.

MR. LOESCHNER: Steve Loeschner.

First of all, to get Mr. Holder warmed up here, I would like to know what has been done in the way of studies of the potential disasters at the New Haven Depot as far as the 400 tons that are there. RA-1

About the only natural disasters I see would be earthquake and tornado. And I would see those potentially causing the roof beams to fail, and depending upon where

Commentor No. 128: Steve Loeschner (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 39

the pallets are located and depending on how those beams would fracture, they could conceivably come down with enough force to not only crush the overpack containers, but perhaps fracture one or more of the flasks inside. So I would like to know what has been done in the way of studies as far as what the maximum release scenario is of a natural disaster for earthquake and tornado. RA-1 (cont'd.)

Well, my heart beats to a little bit of a different drummer, so I'm going to say things that are not going to make the audience all that happy.

First of all, my opinions have changed as time has progressed from what I have commented previously. And I will strongly agree with all of the audience in that I do not want any more mercury to ever come to this area. On that, my opinion is pretty solid. AC-1

Now, as far as the matter of a consolidation, we get into the area of ethics and morality, okay? If Tooele, Utah, and Hawthorne, Nevada, have expressed some willingness or degree of acceptability, what comes to mind here is a question of informed consent. Did those people have a clue as far as what they would be getting into? PP-1

I can say with a very, very high degree of certainty that we have an absolute right to say no more mercury in this area, but I am not prepared to say that we have a right to have it removed from the area from the standpoint

Commentor No. 128: Steve Loeschner (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 40

that it will only hurt somebody else someplace else.

And I don't know absent informed consent that that can be done. It would be good that it would be done. It is something that I would want, but it is not something that can be asked for nor can it be demanded.

As far as our lives, the gentleman was up here earlier talking about other elements, so we'll just take arsenic, for example. I presume that some of the younger members of the audience are into cell phones. Well, folks, your cell phone won't work without arsenic, okay? And I can comfortably say that everyone in this room enjoys a good life because of mercury. If you didn't have mercury in those lights, we would be in a world of hurt.

But nonetheless, yes, I would like for Mr. West to explain what he has in the way of tornado and earthquake studies and the maximum possible release scenario.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir.

Is there a Rick Tinney?

Okay. How about Melvin Krueckeberg and to be followed by Alecia Martin.

MR. KRUECKEBERG: I'm Melvin Krueckeberg, 9519 Iroquois Trace. I really wasn't going to talk tonight but, you know, I remember in the 1950s we had atomic tests in Utah. And the radiation, you know, the

Commentor No. 129: Melvin Krueckeberg (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 40

that it will only hurt somebody else someplace else.

And I don't know absent informed consent that that can be done. It would be good that it would be done. It is something that I would want, but it is not something that can be asked for nor can it be demanded.

As far as our lives, the gentleman was up here earlier talking about other elements, so we'll just take arsenic, for example. I presume that some of the younger members of the audience are into cell phones. Well, folks, your cell phone won't work without arsenic, okay? And I can comfortably say that everyone in this room enjoys a good life because of mercury. If you didn't have mercury in those lights, we would be in a world of hurt.

But nonetheless, yes, I would like for Mr. West to explain what he has in the way of tornado and earthquake studies and the maximum possible release scenario.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir.

Is there a Rick Tinney?

Okay. How about Melvin Krueckeberg and to be followed by Alecia Martin.

MR. KRUECKEBERG: I'm Melvin Krueckeberg, 9519 Iroquois Trace. I really wasn't going to talk tonight but, you know, I remember in the 1950s we had atomic tests in Utah. And the radiation, you know, the

RN-1

Commentor No. 129: Melvin Krueckeberg (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 41

government said it isn't, you know, it won't hurt you. And you say this mercury is real safe here.

Well, these tests were conducted. And radiation clouds, they drifted down to St. George, Utah. And the people from Washington came down and said don't worry, it won't hurt you a bit. And they went back to Washington. And, you know, years later people dropped dead just like flies. And I just wonder, I guess I just don't trust the government.

RN-1 (cont'd.)

MR. LAWSON: Alecia Martin. And Ms. Martin is the last person I have on my list. After she speaks, I will go through the ones that I called who did not respond, and then I will ask if there is anybody else here who would like to speak.

MS. MARTIN: My name is Alecia Martin. I'm the vice chairman of the Mayor's Youth Advisory Council.

Mercury is the second most toxic element on earth next to plutonium. The amount of mercury found in one mercury thermometer is enough to pollute a small lake. This means if you bring the nation's mercury here and it accidentally is spilled, the entire ecosystem of New Haven and its surrounding neighbors will be severely diminished.

Mercury vapor is odorless, colorless, and very toxic. Even though liquid mercury evaporates slowly, a significant amount of mercury vapor can build up in the

Commentor No. 130: Cheryl Hitzemann (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 46

that exceed the standards along with other hazardous substances such as lead as mentioned previously by Mr. Kinney I believe in his report.

Also, I want to take the opportunity to thank Representative Phyllis Pond, our state representative of Indianapolis, and Mr. Ed Rousseau, Commissioner Marla Irving, and Commissioner Linda Bloom who could not be with us this evening. They have all come on board opposing the mercury. State Senator Charles (Bud) Meeks who is undergoing medical treatment and could not be with us this evening, he is also opposed. And you have all heard from Congressman Mark Souder.

Thank you for your time.

MR. HOLDER: Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Before you start speaking, I just want to apologize for any mix-up at registration. I'm not sure what happened, but it happened, and we'll remedy it.

Please.

MS. HITZEMANN: My name is Cheryl Hitzemann. I live at 7704 Preakness Cove, Fort Wayne, Indiana. As indicated, I did mark the statement. Probably folks remembered me from the last time and figured even if they didn't call me, I would be speaking anyway.

I do want to address your Environmental Impact Statement. I reviewed both your Executive Summary and the SE-1

Commentor No. 130: Cheryl Hitzemann (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 47

complete copy that you put in the New Haven library, and I found no real evaluation of the socioeconomic impact on this community.

Like the toxic dump a few miles from here, the impact of Casad's current facility has never been evaluated. The U.S. Government came here 50 years ago and took productive farm land to start the operation that sits there today. Casad's facility has certainly impacted development for the past 50 years, and your Environment Impact Statement fails to address those issues. SE-1 (cont'd.)

In addition to not addressing the socioeconomic impact, in addition it doesn't address the impact on a community that's already psychologically, socially, and economically overburdened with 4 million tons of hazardous waste on the other border. SE-2

I'm concerned about the veracity of the information that's been provided either in writing or in the back hallway. Two years ago, you came to New Haven and talked about closing this depot and giving the land to the City of New Haven. As a result, the City dropped its guard and half trusted you. Now you're back here, and we're on the short list of sites for consolidation of over 4,000 tons of poison. PN-1

Two years ago, you stood in the back of this auditorium and told me you could not sell the excess AS-1

Commentor No. 130: Cheryl Hitzemann (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 48

mercury because it would upset the world market. You suggested that to do so would put mercury mines in South America, miners in South America out of work and result in those people turning to raising cocoa beans for income. You were telling me our choice was mercury or drugs.

I have reviewed your Executive Summary and your Environmental Impact Statement. I could find no discussion regarding the potential for increased drug traffic if the mercury is sold. If this was an issue considered in your decision-making, it should be included in the report. If it was not, then I want to know why you felt it was appropriate to blow smoke up my rear end two years ago and present that argument to begin with. AS-1 (cont'd.)

We deserve a legitimate Impact Statement that addresses the issues of concern to this community. This bogus Impact Statement was prepared to support a decision that you all made more than two years ago. NP-1

You are planning on spending at least $20 million to store material for 40 years that right now is worth approximately $18 million and the value of which is declining. While the value of it is declining, its toxicity will not, and that mercury needs a permanent site if it is not going to be sold. AS-1

If it has true economic value, sell it. If not, stop

Commentor No. 130: Cheryl Hitzemann (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 49

pretending that it is something other than hazardous waste that you may decide to dump in our community because it is the cheapest place to put it.

AS-1 (cont'd.)

MR. LAWSON: Thank you for your time. Is there anyone else who would like to speak?

Yes, sir, please. And then I will take this lady over here, please.

MR. MEEKS: My name is Bud Meeks, and I'm the State Senator for the 14th District. The Casad Depot is in the 14th District.

There has been a lot said this evening, but I just want to go back and take you back to Palm Sunday in 1965. I was sitting over on U.S. 30 in a patrol car and was a deputy sheriff. And a Level 5 tornado came through and split right around Fort Wayne. It killed 17 people in Goshen, Indiana, and it ruined a city by the name of Utany, Ohio, just across the border. It put this community in darkness for over five days.

Can you imagine what a Level 5 tornado would do if it hit that structure that's wood, tipped over your mercury, and then blew it over 15 miles of Allen County and Ohio. Who would pick it up, and what an ecological disaster that would be.

You are in Tornado Alley, and we have tornados here all the time. Thank God Casad has not been hit, but I

Commentor No. 131: Indiana State Senate
Honorable Bud Meeks (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

pretending that it is something other than hazardous waste that you may decide to dump in our community because it is the cheapest place to put it.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you for your time. Is there anyone else who would like to speak?

Yes, sir, please. And then I will take this lady over here, please.

MR. MEEKS: My name is Bud Meeks, and I'm the State Senator for the 14th District. The Casad Depot is in the 14th District.

There has been a lot said this evening, but I just want to go back and take you back to Palm Sunday in 1965. I was sitting over on U.S. 30 in a patrol car and was a deputy sheriff. And a Level 5 tornado came through and split right around Fort Wayne. It killed 17 people in Goshen, Indiana, and it ruined a city by the name of Utany, Ohio, just across the border. It put this community in darkness for over five days.

Can you imagine what a Level 5 tornado would do if it hit that structure that's wood, tipped over your mercury, and then blew it over 15 miles of Allen County and Ohio. Who would pick it up, and what an ecological disaster that would be. RA-3

You are in Tornado Alley, and we have tornados here all the time. Thank God Casad has not been hit, but I

Commentor No. 131: Indiana State Senate
Honorable Bud Meeks (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 50

will guarantee you the people that have just witnessed all the tornados in Missouri, Tennessee, and the southern part of Indiana ruin entire communities, and you want to put all that mercury in one location. I know one thing, it will be a disaster if something hits there. RA-3 (cont'd.)

I would hope that you would consider that this community has suffered through at least one dump that is on the toxic dump, the major dumps right now. When it used to catch fire out here, it would shut down the entire community. OS-3

They fought for years to close this hazardous waste material where the truckers would bring their stuff in. And one was caught right over here on 30 washing out the bed of his truck and allowing it to wash into the creek.

These people are tired. They fought so hard for so long. They deserve a break. I would think that, sure, it's probably cheaper to bring it here, but that's not the whole thing. The money is not the issue. The safety of this community is the issue. This community is tired. It should get a break. And I think the federal government should give it a break. RN-1

And I think they ought to take the dump exactly to where the people who said we will take it in Utah and leave it there and consolidate it in that area. Because I guarantee you if that tornado hits that facility and all AC-1

Commentor No. 131: Indiana State Senate
Honorable Bud Meeks (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 51

that mercury goes all over Eastern Allen County and Ohio, you will have a disaster on your hands that you will have for the rest of your life.

Thank you.

MS. WEERTS: My name is Gretchen Weerts, and I live at 1727 Duart Court in New Haven. And I teach at St. John Lutheran School near Hoagland. I want to compliment -- I'm nervous.

I want to compliment the teenagers who have spoken tonight. I really applaud them. They spoke well, and they considered the facts. And I would like you and I to consider the facts too as we understand them and to understand them and to realize that you and I can make a difference. Our actions, our letters, our comments will make a difference. PP-1

In the 1980s, we lived in another part of Indiana, and wastewater was used to fertilize farm land near our home. We had no knowledge of this until after it started, and then we had the opportunity to speak at public meetings. We moved after that, and I don't know what happened, but it seemed terribly unfair that the State could allow this to happen. OS-3

And I just ask that if you feel strongly about this you talk about it, you write about it, and you speak about it. PP-1

Commentor No. 132: Gretchen Weerts (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 51

that mercury goes all over Eastern Allen County and Ohio, you will have a disaster on your hands that you will have for the rest of your life.

Thank you.

MS. WEERTS: My name is Gretchen Weerts, and I live at 1727 Duart Court in New Haven. And I teach at St. John Lutheran School near Hoagland. I want to compliment -- I'm nervous.

I want to compliment the teenagers who have spoken tonight. I really applaud them. They spoke well, and they considered the facts. And I would like you and I to consider the facts too as we understand them and to understand them and to realize that you and I can make a difference. Our actions, our letters, our comments will make a difference. PP-1

In the 1980s, we lived in another part of Indiana, and wastewater was used to fertilize farm land near our home. We had no knowledge of this until after it started, and then we had the opportunity to speak at public meetings. We moved after that, and I don't know what happened, but it seemed terribly unfair that the State could allow this to happen. OS-3

And I just ask that if you feel strongly about this you talk about it, you write about it, and you speak about it. PP-1

Commentor No. 132: Gretchen Weerts (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 52

Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who would like to speak now?

Over here, please.

MS. TOMPKINS: Hi, my name is Miranda Tompkins, and I'm a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council, and I would just like to say that there has been a leak before, and what makes you so sure that there is not going to be a leak again? How can you guarantee the people of New Haven that they are safe?

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to speak now?

Well, I'm going to take a little initiative here. We are now at about 8:30. The center offered to take down some of the questions that were asked in your comments and to try to respond to those. And I assume that that is still possible. I appreciate them doing that.

What I would like to suggest here is that Lisa Robbins who is here taking your comments, we have set up a room for her out in the hallway, Room 114-A, and if anybody would like to make comments up until 9:00 at least, you should feel free to go in and visit her.

We're going to take a break in a couple of minutes for about ten so we can get organized in responding to

Commentor No. 133: New Haven, Indiana, Mayor's Advisory Council
Miranda Tompkins (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 52

Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who would like to speak now?

Over here, please.

MS. TOMPKINS: Hi, my name is Miranda Tompkins, and I'm a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council, and I would just like to say that there has been a leak before, and what makes you so sure that there is not going to be a leak again? How can you guarantee the people of New Haven that they are safe? RA-1

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to speak now?

Well, I'm going to take a little initiative here. We are now at about 8:30. The center offered to take down some of the questions that were asked in your comments and to try to respond to those. And I assume that that is still possible. I appreciate them doing that.

What I would like to suggest here is that Lisa Robbins who is here taking your comments, we have set up a room for her out in the hallway, Room 114-A, and if anybody would like to make comments up until 9:00 at least, you should feel free to go in and visit her.

We're going to take a break in a couple of minutes for about ten so we can get organized in responding to

Commentor No. 134: Sandra Dager (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 54

answered, you may want to make another comment, and that would give you an opportunity to do so.

MR. LOESCHNER: But my question is why can their answers not be recorded on the record?

MR. LAWSON: Okay. I'll tell you what will happen is any of the questions that were asked as part of the comment period will be addressed in the report. So there will be an answer for those particular questions.

I will raise it with the center and see if they want to do that, but the theory is this way they are going to get answered in the final report, and it's also an opportunity for people to make comments as well.

We will take a break for ten minutes and start up at 8:40. Thank you.

(A break was had, after which the taking of the following comments were made privately to the court reporter.)

MS. DAGER: My name is Sandra Dager. I live at 9510 Pawnee Way, New Haven, Indiana.

They were just talking about questions in there, and one of the answers from the lady, I don't know what her name was that is from the government, that not the government, but this country is still importing mercury from other countries. We have this stockpile that we don't know what to do with, and we are still importing it.

AS-1
PN-2

Commentor No. 134: Sandra Dager (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 55

Now, something is wrong with this logic where mercury is stockpiled and we are getting it from other countries and we don't know what to do with what we've got now.

I know that's government logic, but it is not Indiana, New Haven logic.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Gottschalt is concerned about a tornado hitting the New Haven facility, is that right, sir?

MR. GOTTSCHALT: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON: And in the case of a Level 5 tornado, he is concerned about the winds picking up the flasks, and since he lives across the street from the facility carrying these flasks into his home. Is that right, sir?

MR. GOTTSCHALT: Yes.

Okay. And in that case, he is concerned about the flasks rupturing and contaminating his place with mercury as well. And he would like to know whether this is a possibility.

Is that pretty much right, sir? Is there anything you would like to add to that?

MR. GOTTSCHALT: No.

So you believe it would cause your house to be destroyed?

MR. GOTTSCHALT: Yeah.

MR. JOHNSON: And you with it?

AS-1
PN-2
(cont'd.)

Commentor No. 135: Mr. Gottschalt (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 55

Now, something is wrong with this logic where mercury is stockpiled and we are getting it from other countries and we don't know what to do with what we've got now.

I know that's government logic, but it is not Indiana, New Haven logic.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Gottschalt is concerned about a tornado hitting the New Haven facility, is that right, sir? RA-3

MR. GOTTSCHALT: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON: And in the case of a Level 5 tornado, he is concerned about the winds picking up the flasks, and since he lives across the street from the facility carrying these flasks into his home. Is that right, sir? RA-3

MR. GOTTSCHALT: Yes.

Okay. And in that case, he is concerned about the flasks rupturing and contaminating his place with mercury as well. And he would like to know whether this is a possibility. RA-3

Is that pretty much right, sir? Is there anything you would like to add to that?

MR. GOTTSCHALT: No.

So you believe it would cause your house to be destroyed? RA-3

MR. GOTTSCHALT: Yeah.

MR. JOHNSON: And you with it?

Commentor No. 135: Mr. Gottschalt (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 56

MR. GOTTSCHALT: Yeah.

MR. JOHNSON: Does that pretty much sum it up, sir? Do you have any other comments you would like to make?

MR. GOTTSCHALT: There is a lot of comments, but that's enough.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you very much, sir. I appreciate it.

MS. KENNERK: I just have a comment that's not been brought up by anybody else. There is a school and a church facility that's been there long before Casad was approximately a mile and a half I would guess, within two miles, and nobody has mentioned that.

I agree that everybody is talking about New Haven because it's a city, but still, there is this little tiny school that is out there. And I'm sure nobody would want their children, grandchildren, or anyone to be exposed to that, especially if there is a disaster as they talked about.

Another comment they were talking in the meeting that is going on now about they are still importing mercury from overseas or out of the United States. I think that it should be a priority that they dispose of what is stored here and not buy from other countries.

I mean, to me, like many of them said, it doesn't make sense to buy it from somebody else if they have this

Commentor No. 136: Ms. Kennerk (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 56

MR. GOTTSCHALT: Yeah.

MR. JOHNSON: Does that pretty much sum it up, sir? Do you have any other comments you would like to make?

MR. GOTTSCHALT: There is a lot of comments, but that's enough.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you very much, sir. I appreciate it.

MS. KENNERK: I just have a comment that's not been brought up by anybody else. There is a school and a church facility that's been there long before Casad was approximately a mile and a half I would guess, within two miles, and nobody has mentioned that.

I agree that everybody is talking about New Haven because it's a city, but still, there is this little tiny school that is out there. And I'm sure nobody would want their children, grandchildren, or anyone to be exposed to that, especially if there is a disaster as they talked about. RA-1

Another comment they were talking in the meeting that is going on now about they are still importing mercury from overseas or out of the United States. I think that it should be a priority that they dispose of what is stored here and not buy from other countries. AS-1 PN-2

I mean, to me, like many of them said, it doesn't make sense to buy it from somebody else if they have this

Commentor No. 136: Ms. Kennerk (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 57

1 potential over here of disaster and bringing it in from
2 somewhere else.
3 And that's basically all I wanted to say right now.
4 It was a good meeting, a lot of good comments.
5 (The public meeting concluded at 10:00 p.m.)
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

AS-1
PN-2
(cont'd.)

Esquire Deposition Services

D.C - 1-800-441-3376
MD - 1-800-539-6398

Commentor No. 137: Rick Kinney (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 19

I would like to go on with my list. And if anybody knows a John Bennett or Beverly Werling or Ed Garren and they appear, just let me know.

The next speaker I have on my list is Rick Kinney. Mr. Kinney would be followed by Tom Johnson and then John and Berenice Brown.

Mr. Kinney, please.

MR. KINNEY: Hi, how are you doing? My name is Rick Kinney. I just want to thank everyone for coming out tonight.

I have been a resident and my family has been a resident of New Haven for -- I have been a resident for 19 years, and a lot of my family has lived here their whole lives. Having a family and being a resident here, I feel that my voice needs to be heard. By the way, I'm speaking for the voice of my generation. Not a lot of young people are here I see.

That's -- the significance of that, now, you have to realize that my generation and the future generations to come are the ones that will have to live with the consequences of your actions which I wish were our -- I wish we could make that decision, but I don't know if we can. We can voice our opposition as much as we can, but I'm asking you guys to not bring mercury here. AC-1

So please take these words into consideration. I

Commentor No. 137: Rick Kinney (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 20

have obtained documents that are very, very disturbing and quite frankly disgusting. Now, I just want to make something very clear to everyone that everything I am about to tell you is backed up by government documentation that I have handed out at the beginning of the meeting. And more copies are available for anyone who did not receive them. I'm a little nervous. Sorry.

Let me give you a little history about the Casad Depot for those of you who don't know. In 1942, construction began of the New Haven Depot, and active operations began the following year. That same year, the depot was officially renamed the Casad.

In the early 1980s, the Defense National Stockpile Center under the GSA assumed management responsibility of the site.

The site is currently an active storage depot which also possesses a current license from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the storage of radioactive materials. I have lived in New Haven for 19 years, and I have never, ever heard of nuclear waste being stored at Casad until a few days ago when I received these documents. OS-4

The Defense Logistics Agency has also been storing and transporting such hazardous materials as arsenic, lead, cadmium, and mercury and an ore called baddeleyite

Commentor No. 137: Rick Kinney (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 21

ore. Baddeleyite ore is a natural zirconium oxide found in Brazil. The ore contains radioactive materials such as uranium and thorium. OS-4

According to Defense Logistics Agency documents, the ore at the Casad Depot is stored in two piles in an open area in the northwest corner of the depot. One of those piles which is No. 111 on the handout that I handed you earlier, No. 111 on your diagram contains over 31,981,402 pounds of this radioactive ore. And that's backed up by the documentation that I received. According to -- that's according to Defense Logistics' documents. This pile of radioactive waste stood 28 feet high with a length of 296 feet and a width of 60 feet.

According to Defense Logistics' documents, in October of 2001, a company by the name of ERS Solutions was contacted by the Defense Logistics Agency to perform soil sample tests and scoping surveys of the soil underneath and around the pile containing radioactive contaminants.

According to the radiological survey and sample plan documents prepared by ERS Solutions, I quote, the scoping survey confirmed that residual radioactivity remains in the storage area and on the road leading from the storage area to the rail scale and the rail scale itself and at the area along the railroad tracks used for shrink wrapping the transport cars. OS-4

Commentor No. 137: Rick Kinney (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 22

The area used to share the ore was found during the scoping survey to possess levels of residual radioactivity sufficient to require remediation, end quote. OS-4 (cont'd.)

In February of 2001, a final focus site investigation report of the New Haven Depot was conducted by Parsons Engineering Science, Incorporated. I do have copies of that available for anyone interested. I think a lot of you already have it. Unfortunately, I ran out of some of them. I'm sorry. OS-2

In the investigation, it included the testing of soil, groundwater, surface water and sediment and air pathway contaminants. Arsenic, lead, and mercury also were all found to be present in numerous different field tests of soil, groundwater and surface water according to Defense Logistics Agency documents. All of this information included in the package I handed out earlier is backed up by documents which are actually documents that you have. OS-2

MR. LAWSON: Sir, can I ask you to summarize your final comments?

MR. KINNEY: Yes. If we can stop this mercury from being brought to our town, the U.S. Defense Department, and this is what I have heard in the past, the U.S. Defense Department plans to close down the storage facility for good, therefore, enabling cleanup efforts to OS-5

Esquire Deposition Services D.C - 1-800-441-3376 MD - 1-800-539-6398

Commentor No. 137: Rick Kinney (New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 23

1 begin. The Defense Department will not be held
2 responsible for cleanup efforts as long as the storage
3 portion of the Casad remains active.
4 Please write your congressmen and your senators
5 telling them your thoughts and opinions. Please take into
6 consideration the value of the property in the City of
7 New Haven and Woodburn. If New Haven becomes the single
8 designated site for all the mercury in the United States,
9 could you imagine the detrimental effect this would have
10 on the average homeowner in these cities? Could you
11 imagine New Haven becoming a ghost town? We have to stand
12 up to this together.
13 Thank you.
14 MR. LAWSON: Thank you.
15 Tom Johnson. Is Mr. Johnson here?
16 John and Berenice Brown?
17 I have another Paula Smith. Is there a second Paula
18 Smith? And then a Dale and Joan Hermann who would be
19 next.
20 So this must be John and Berenice Brown. Thank you
21 for coming.
22 MR. BROWN: I signed up because I knew she would have
23 something to say, so I'm going to rely on her saying it.
24 I do have a question first. And I would like to know if
25 our federal government is still procuring mercury. We

OS-5 (cont'd.)

SE-2

Commentor No. 138: City of New Haven
Honorable Terry McDonald
(New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting)

Page 43

irritable with bad kidneys and don't -- just don't let the mercury come into New Haven.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. Let me just review the list in case somebody has come back. John Bennett, Beverly Werling, Ed Garren, Tom Johnson, Dale or Joan Hermann, Don Markley, Dave Gilbert, Rick Tinney.

And I see a person here who would like to speak. Go ahead, sir.

MR. MCDONALD: Terry McDonald, mayor of New Haven. For the record, I registered via telephone and in front on the registration card. Is there anyone else that registered via telephone and didn't get called either? Is there anyone else? Okay.

MR. LAWSON: We will get you all.

MR. MCDONALD: Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposal to stockpile at one consolidated location the mercury in the DNSC inventory.

The City of New Haven is opposed to any consolidation of mercury or any other materials at the New Haven Depot. Although the DNSC has in recent years invested taxpayers' dollars in the New Haven Depot in their efforts to update the facility, the fact remains the New Haven Depot is an old facility that was slated for closure. AC-1

Commentor No. 138: City of New Haven
Honorable Terry McDonald
(New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 44

I have several concerns. I have toured the complex and find the complex to be well maintained, but with that said, I take exception to the level of security provided at the depot. The security is such that even an amateur criminal or terrorist could neutralize the security gaining access to the building and make off with highly toxic mercury at any time. SB-1

Allen County, Indiana, is a growing, productive community. Our population in the 2000 Census showed us to be a population of 337,000 people as you have heard many people say this evening. The closest city to the depot is New Haven with a population in excess of 12,400 whereas the Mineral County, Nevada, site known as Hawthorne Army Depot has a population of the entire county of 5,071 people. AC-1

It would only make sense to consolidate the mercury at a facility that has the exact same rating on the Summary of Cumulative Impacts and Risks, Table ES-4, as found in the MM EIS. Consolidation of the mercury should be in a place that has as low a population base and density as possible.

There is a great deal of concern about the effects of consolidation as it relates to the socioeconomic impact upon our community. New Haven is a growing community. We are seeing an increase in our single family homes with SE-2

Commentor No. 138: City of New Haven
Honorable Terry McDonald
(New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

eight new subdivisions on-line or in the process of planning.

There are new businesses coming to our city as well. Growth is focused on the east side and to the south. The east side of our community will see an increased interest in light, clean manufacturing and commercial development. The consolidation of mercury stockpile will easily kill development on our city's east side. There are no benefits to our citizens if the mercury is stockpiled at the New Haven Depot. SE-2 (cont'd.)

My last concern is certainly not my least concern. I have dedicated my life to the safety and the well-being of our citizens as both a medic and a police officer and now as their mayor. Safety for our citizens and the environment is the No. 1 priority of any elected official. RA-1 Unfortunately, New Haven officials for too long have had to deal with environmental hazards that have and will continue to place our citizens at risk.

An editorial by the Journal Gazette, our local morning paper, says it best. Enough is enough. New Haven and East Allen County are not a dumping ground. It does not matter how secure the packaging is, eventually all packaging will fail. RA-1

Reports generated for the DNSC specific to the New Haven Depot indicate that there are levels of mercury OS-2

Commentor No. 138: City of New Haven
Honorable Terry McDonald
(New Haven, Indiana Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 46

that exceed the standards along with other hazardous substances such as lead as mentioned previously by Mr. Kinney I believe in his report.

OS-2 (cont'd.)

Also, I want to take the opportunity to thank Representative Phyllis Pond, our state representative of Indianapolis, and Mr. Ed Rousseau, Commissioner Marla Irving, and Commissioner Linda Bloom who could not be with us this evening. They have all come on board opposing the mercury. State Senator Charles (Bud) Meeks who is undergoing medical treatment and could not be with us this evening, he is also opposed. And you have all heard from Congressman Mark Souder.

Thank you for your time.

MR. HOLDER: Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Before you start speaking, I just want to apologize for any mix-up at registration. I'm not sure what happened, but it happened, and we'll remedy it.

Please.

MS. HITZEMANN: My name is Cheryl Hitzemann. I live at 7704 Preakness Cove, Fort Wayne, Indiana. As indicated, I did mark the statement. Probably folks remembered me from the last time and figured even if they didn't call me, I would be speaking anyway.

I do want to address your Environmental Impact Statement. I reviewed both your Executive Summary and the

Commentor No. 139: Col. (Ret.) W. E. Ellington

From the MM EIS Web site–

Re: Tooele as the sole site. I own property in Tooele and live about 40 miles (downwind) from there. I have no qualms about mercury storage there. However, I do have qualms about putting all of our mercury "eggs" in one basket. For strategic reasons, we should have at least one more storage site. (If the stuff is purely waste, feel free to put it all at Tooele. However, if there is some potential military or industrial use, we should disperse the storage.) W E Ellington Col, USAF (Ret) **DM-1**

Commentor No. 140: Patty Peck

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Patty Peck and I live in Hillsborough. I would like all the mercury moved. There are people that live across the street from where the mercury is stored. Please move it all to an area where it will not affect anyone. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 141: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I am a resident of Hillsborough and would like to see all of the mercury moved to a site far, far away. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 142: Karen Lichfield

From the MM EIS Web site–

NO, NO, NO to mercury storage in Utah. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 143: Brian Moore

From the MM EIS Web site–

I'd rather not have Tooele City become the dumping ground for other states waste. Especially this proposal of storing Mercury. Please consider what Tooele City already stores for the nation. Enough is enough. It seems whenever there is a waste product that needs a place to go, Tooele City is always suggested. I don't care how safe the storage facilities are or how safe you think transporting here will be but we all know the optimal plan does not happen. **AC-1** **RA-1** **RT-1**

Commentor No. 144: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I am a Hillsborough resident and would like all of the mercury removed. The mercury should not be in a densely populated area like Hillsborough. **AC-1**

Commentor No 145: Utah State Senate Honorable Ron Allen

From the MM EIS Web site–

Has the EIS for the Tooele location looked at the large aquifer that sits just downhill from the proposed storage site and runs nearly 10 miles northward? **WR-3**

Commentor No. 146: The Chlorine Institute, Inc.
Arthur E. Dungan

THE CHLORINE INSTITUTE, INC., 1300 WILSON BOULEVARD, ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-741-5760
Fax 703-741-6068
http://www.cl2.com

Stephen R. Fitzgerald, *Chairman*
Kathleen A. Shaver, *President*

July 11, 2003 ***via Certified Mail - Return Receipt Requested***

Attention: Project Manager
Mercury Management EIS
DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6228

Dear Sirs or Madams:

Reference: Federal Register of April 11, 2003: Notice of Availability of Draft Environmental Impact Statement; Mercury Management

The Chlorine Institute is pleased to have the opportunity to comment on the Defense National Stockpile Center's (DNSC) Draft Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement as referenced in the April 11, 2003 Federal Register. The Institute commends the DNSC for its open and transparent process that it has conducted in addressing the long-term management of its mercury stockpile.

The Chlorine Institute, Inc., founded in 1924, is a 210-member, not-for-profit trade association of chlor-alkali producers worldwide, as well as packagers, distributors, users, and suppliers. The Institute's mission is the promotion of safety and the protection of human health and the environment in the manufacture, distribution and use of chlorine, sodium hydroxide, potassium hydroxide and sodium hypochlorite, plus the distribution and use of hydrogen chloride. The Institute's North American Producer members account for more than 98 percent of the total chlorine production capacity of the U.S., Canada, and Mexico. In the United States, there are nine facilities that produce chlorine using the mercury cell process accounting for 10% of the annual chlorine production. All are members of the Chlorine Institute.

The Institute supports the DNSC's preferred alternative that consolidated storage at a single site is the best way to achieve DNSC's objectives to safely manage the mercury stockpile in an environmentally sound manner. The Institute offers the following specific comments to the draft EIS: **AC-1**

- The Institute believes the Executive Summary should have some discussion of the Treatment option that was a part of the original EIS alternatives. We understand that this **EO-1**

A Responsible Care® Partner Association

Commentor No. 146: The Chlorine Institute, Inc.
Arthur E. Dungan (continued)

Defense National Stockpile Center
CI Comments on DNSC's EIS for Mercury Management
July 11, 2003
Page 2

---

option was rejected because there is no known safe and environmentally sound treatment technology that would convert the mercury to a more stable, less toxic form prior to storage. The Institute believes it is important to state in the Executive Summary that this option was in fact considered and rejected. The Institute suggests that the statements made in the Mercury Management Alternatives paper pertaining to Treatment Alternatives prepared by the DNSC be copied in total into the Executive Summary **EO-1 (cont'd.)**

- The Institute believes that the consolidated storage site should be capable of being expanded to handle mercury that is not a part of the current DNSC stockpile. The Institute suggests that the site be capable of being expanded to handle a total quantity of 15,000 – 20,000 tons. The Institute believes it would be likely that other surplus mercury would be brought into the site at a future time. **PO-2**

- The site should be one that could be turned over to another government agency or to a private party operating it under a government contract should it become national policy to retire other surplus mercury.

- The Institute believes that the current storage sites are being operated safely and in an environmentally sound manner. (Institute staff visited the site in New Jersey in 2001.) DNSC needs to evaluate all potential sites for consolidation in a comprehensive process. Prior to the consolidation, an education campaign should be conducted at the selected site to explain to the community how the mercury will be stored and to convince the community that it can be done in a safe and environmentally sound manner, The DLA has a history of such safe storage at its current sites. **PP-1**

Very truly yours,

Arthur E. Dungan
Vice President- Safety, Health, and Environment

X:\Local\Regulatory Filings and Comments\Mercury DNSC - DLA Final.doc

Commentor No. 147: Jerry Mazza

Project Manager:

Based on a careful analysis of the MM EIS Executive Summary, I believe your team may have made in error in framing this important decision about management of the mercury, which led to an error in selecting the Preferred Alternative.

There are two key facts, two options, and only one viable solution:

Facts:
1- "Congress has granted DNSC the authority to sell the entire inventory of mercury"
2- "DNSC is scheduled to cease operation as an independent organization in 2007 and would prefer to
arrange for the disposition of the mercury before this date"

Options: AP-2
1- Sell the mercury now
2- Spend $21 to $62 million and incur transportation risks to consolidate the mercury, spend several $ million more per year to store it, then sell the mercury by 2007

Only one viable solution:
Sell the mercury now.

Reasons:
1- Consolidation is incompatible with DNSC's long term closure strategy.
2- No justification has been provided for spending $ millions to consolidate and store the mercury in lieu of selling it now

Please provide an explanation if you disagree with the above.

I am confident that your team approached this decision in good faith and with due diligence, but in the course of extensive data gathering and analysis, may have inadvertently overlooked the striking simplicity of the above decision framework.

I hope you find this helpful. I look forward to your response.

Jerry Mazza
Vice President and Management Consultant
Strategy Partners Group
(and resident of the Somerville, NJ area)

Commentor No. 148: Oak Ridge Reservation Local Oversight Committee Norman A. Mulvenon

LOC INC
Oak Ridge Reservation Local Oversight Committee

July 17, 2003

ATTN: Project Manager
Mercury Management EIS
DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John F. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Submitted via FAX to: 1-888-306-8818

Subject: Draft Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) dated April 2003

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Citizens' Advisory Panel (CAP) of the Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR) Local Oversight Committee, Inc. (LOC) offers comments below on the draft Mercury Management EIS. The LOC is a non-profit regional organization that provides local government and citizen input into issues affecting the DOE's Oak Ridge Reservation. The Board of Directors of the LOC is composed of elected and appointed officials from the seven-county ORR region and the CAP chair. The CAP is a stakeholder organization with up to 20 members who represent the greater ORR region.

The CAP supports removal of the mercury owned by the Defense National Stockpile Center (DNSC) that is currently stored at the Y-12 National Security Complex in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. AG-1

Although not in the scope of this EIS, the CAP would like DNSC and the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) to consider eventual addition of surplus mercury, owned by DOE and meeting purity specifications, to the DNSC stockpile. PO-2

The CAP endorses the preferred alternative of consolidated storage, and suggests that a blended alternative be considered. Sale of the mercury after it is consolidated at a single site would offset environmental damage from mining and over time diminish the amount that the U.S. government would be required to manage, eventually allowing DNSC to end the program completely. This would provide the best value for the taxpayers and the environment. AG-2

Sincerely,

Norman A. Mulvenon

Norman A. Mulvenon
Chair, LOC Citizens' Advisory Panel

Anderson • Meigs • Rhea • Roane • City of Oak Ridge • Knox • Loudon • Morgan

Commentor No. 149: Deon Lyon

July 9, 2003

Please do not send mercury to Tooele, Utah - AC-1

Thanks

Deon Lyon -

I am told mercury can be deadly. At issue is the federal government's stock pile of 4,890 tons of mercury, the liquid metal found in old thermometers. Mercury can be deadly, when it vaporizes in the environment. It is also a hazardous substance when it is not contained.

I say "if its OK where it is why move it from a government property to a civilian property?" AN-1

Shinton

Deseret Morning News, Salt Lake City, Utah Section B. p 1+2 - Wed July 9, 03

Thanks

Deon Lyon

Commentor No. 150: United States Senate
Honorable Robert F. Bennett

ROBERT F. BENNETT
UTAH

COMMITTEES:
APPROPRIATIONS
BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS
JOINT ECONOMIC
SMALL BUSINESS
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, DC 20510–4403
(202) 224–5444

STATE OFFICES:
- WALLACE BENNETT FEDERAL BUILDING
  125 SOUTH STATE, SUITE 4225
  SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84138–1188
  (801) 524–5933
- FEDERAL BUILDING
  324 25TH STREET, SUITE 1410
  OGDEN, UT 84401–2310
  (801) 625–5676
- OLD COURT HOUSE BUILDING
  51 SOUTH UNIVERSITY AVENUE, SUITE 310
  PROVO, UT 84601–4424
  (801) 379–2525
- FEDERAL BUILDING
  196 EAST TABERNACLE, SUITE 42
  ST. GEORGE, UT 84770–3474
  (435) 628–5514
- 2390 WEST HIGHWAY 56
  SUITE 4B
  CEDAR CITY, UT 84720–2686
  (435) 865–1335

July 11, 2003

Cornel Holder
Administrator
Mercury Management EIS DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Dear Mr. Holder:

Recently, my office was contacted by Harry Schinton, a representative of the Tooele County Local Emergency Planning Committee, regarding the possibility of moving the national stockpile of elemental mercury to Tooele.

Mr. Schinton expressed concern that the official comment period, scheduled to end July 18, 2003, has not been of adequate length to fully inform the public and allow all interested parties to express their views. PP-3

Because of these concerns, I write to request that the official comment period be extended an additional 90 days to allow those with concerns, questions, or comments the time to submit them to your office.

I appreciate your willingness to consider my request and look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robert F. Bennett
United States Senator

RFB:br

Commentor No. 151: Mary Hendricks

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Mary Hendricks and I live in Hillsborough. I am calling to ask that you have all of the mercury in Hillsborough removed. It is time for it to go. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 152: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

The Federal Government should be embarrassed by brining more mercury into Hillsborough. Remove it immediately! God forbid a terrorist attack. Get it going and get the stuff out of here. **AC-1** **DM-3**

Commentor No. 153: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I am a resident of Hillsborough and want to express my concern and outrage that we are considered to receive additional amounts of mercury. Mercury is a hazardous substance that has many negative health effects on people. Hillsborough is densely populated and can impact many residents including children. Please remove it from this area. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 154: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Please remove all of the mercury from Hillsborough now. **AC-1** **DM-3**

Commentor No. 155: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I am a Hillsborough resident. Mercury will cause too much of an environmental impact to this area. Please move it out west where the population is more sparse. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 156: Debbie Pinckney

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Debbie Pinckney. I am asking that you please remove all of the mercury from Hillsborough. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 157: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I can’t believe mercury is stored in Hillsborough. Please get it out. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 158: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I am a resident of Hillsborough and would prefer that the mercury is moved from this area. It is a very toxic substance and can cause many medical problems. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 159: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Please don't send the mercury to Tooele, Utah. Everyone wants to dump dangerous garbage here. We are being poisoned. Leave us alone. Don't send it here. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 160: Anonymous

From the MM EIS Web site–

Many citizens of the Western United States are deeply offended by the ongoing "NIMBY" attitude toward placing hazardous waste "out there where no one lives". We're similarly fed up with being told (NAME POISON) "is not hazardous", only to have children and adults die of unexplainably high rates of cancer (can you say "Downwinders"?????) or other disease.

If the DNSC or any other wrong-headed company/agency wants to send mercury or anything else like it to Utah, we suggest that a very simple and binding condition be placed on such a transaction. EVERY single "big shot" involved in the matter, AND THEIR FAMILIES, must make their permanent residence in the IMMEDIATE vicinity of the material for a period of not less than 60 consecutive years. **AC-1**

Anyone willing to take a bet that somebody would do that? Well, if you wouldn't want to have to live next to it, why should we? Find a place that is NOT near highly populated areas (Tooele is actually part of suburban Salt Lake City). We're SICK of taking the country's poison!

Commentor No. 161: Dorothy Miller

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Dorothy Miller and I am calling about the mercury in Hillsborough. When will it all be removed? I heard that they are removing some of it. I want all of it removed and would like to talk to somebody. My number is 908-359-2623, **DM-3** **PP-5**

Commentor No. 162: Richard Hamatake

From the MM EIS Web site–

I have two questions. 1. How did the government come into possession of the Mercury stored by DNSC? 2. Why did the government come into the possession of the Mercury stored by DNSC? Thank You. **PN-2**

Commentor No. 163: Hillsborough Township
Honorable Tony Gwiazdowski (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting)

Page 7

evening is Mayor Tony Gwiacdowski and he will be followed by David Foss.

Good evening, Mayor.

MAYOR GWIACDOWSKI: Thank you and good evening. First of all I want to thank you folks for coming back out to Hillsborough to update us on the progress and an idea on what is happening with this project.

My attendance here tonight is to gather new information, also to listen to the comments of the residents of not only Hillsborough, but comments on the neighbors of the surrounding towns. I think it is important that not only Hillsborough is heard tonight, but Somerset County and neighboring towns because it affects everybody in this geographic area, and also to give you my concerns or my comments or any thoughts about the mercury here in town.

Let me start off by saying you know 50 years ago when mercury first came to the Somerville Depo which is now Hillsborough, the population of New Jersey, the density of New Jersey was not as it is today. Somerset County was a lot different than it is today. Hillsborough was a heck of a lot different than

AN-1

Esquire Deposition Services
1-800-247-8366

Commentor No. 163: Hillsborough Township
Honorable Tony Gwiazdowski (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 8

AN-1 (cont'd.)

it is today.

I remember, just a real quick story, when I was five years old I think it is was my grandfather's cousin had a chicken farm in Hillsborough. I only found this out last December. I used to come here as a four and five year old and feed chickens, thinking it was Somerville, because it was Somerville at that time. It was up on Falcon Road, so I have the history of Hillsborough from about four years old and I just moved back 18 years ago tomorrow. But Hillsborough wasn't as densely populated as it is today. So what was okay back then 40 or 50 years ago, is not really okay today. The area is growing with housing areas, has grown with industry, and it is not the same town as it was in even 15, 20 years ago. That is a concern of mine having the mercury here in town. To have 60 percent of the nation stockpile of mercury at this location I believe is absolutely wrong, and I think it has to be moved. I know the options that you gave earlier, you know, outside in the hall saying, you know, leave it where it is. We could consolidate it here, consolidate it some place else. I think the consolidation is the

AN-1

AC-1

Esquire Deposition Services
1-800-247-8366

Commentor No. 163: Hillsborough Township
Honorable Tony Gwiazdowski (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

important factor, but consolidation here in town with the population of New Jersey I think is the wrong location. It's not my backyard mentality, but it is not in my backyard. There are other areas of the country where -- and there are volunteer townships, I think you had shown on your map in Utah and in New York State. The towns that are volunteering for, I guess, a monetary -- for monetary reasons they have they would almost invite it to their town. So I ask you to really consider that and really, you know, drop Hillsborough as one of the places to have this. AC-1 (cont'd.)

But let me say this, I heard some comments earlier also. I visited the site with Jim Farley back in January when I became the mayor. The mercury is very well, I don't want to use the word hidden, but it is very well protected. I was there with Jim Farley. Then our police chief took me for a tour of the facility. I am satisfied for the safety of the mercury as it is today. The safety is not a question. It is just having the mercury here is my concern. And that's really what I want to stress. SB-1

Commentor No. 163: Hillsborough Township
Honorable Tony Gwiazdowski (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

My job as mayor of the township is to make sure that the health, welfare and safety of the people is first and foremost. I know we talked about safety, we talked about health and welfare, but I think, you know, that is part of my job. I do a lot of different things as a mayor. I marry people, I preside at meetings, but the health, safety and welfare is primarily my responsibility, and I just want to make sure that you folks understand that, that in my opinion that the mercury should not be in Hillsborough and I will do everything I can to convince you.

Someone mentioned Congressman Ferguson before. I had been in contact with Congressman Ferguson over the past year and a half, two years, Congressman Ferguson let me say is a very big friend of Hillsborough. He has been in town, he has been at the site. Numerous times -- we have spoken to him numerous times and Congressman Ferguson had told me that he will do -- he will work with me in any way possible to make sure that Hillsborough is not the site for this mercury or any additional mercury.

I want to thank you folks. I want to

Commentor No. 163: Hillsborough Township
Honorable Tony Gwiazdowski (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

go back, sit down. I want to listen to the people for their opinions, their thoughts and their comments. I want to thank you again for coming out.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Our next speaker is Davis Foss, and Mr. Foss will be followed by Sonya Martin.

MR. FOSS: My name is David Foss. I am a citizen here of Hillsborough. I live off of Homestead Road. I have been here about five years. I am raising my family here as well. I have two young daughters who will be growing up here in Hillsborough. I think there are enough health and ecological concerns here to remove the mercury from the Hillsborough area, and consider some of the other additional sites. I guess maybe it is financial reasons for them now, but once they also look at potentially other EIS sites perhaps what these risks that are there might exclude them from additional consideration. Perhaps maybe they can consider other military sites. I know there are more military sites around the United States who are kept far from other public or residential areas. Potentially they could use some of the empty locations that

Commentor No. 164: David Foss (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting)

go back, sit down. I want to listen to the people for their opinions, their thoughts and their comments. I want to thank you again for coming out.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Our next speaker is Davis Foss, and Mr. Foss will be followed by Sonya Martin.

MR. FOSS: My name is David Foss. I am a citizen here of Hillsborough. I live off of Homestead Road. I have been here about five years. I am raising my family here as well. I have two young daughters who will be growing up here in Hillsborough. I think there are enough health and ecological concerns here to remove the mercury from the Hillsborough area, and consider some of the other additional sites. I guess maybe it is financial reasons for them now, but once they also look at potentially other EIS sites perhaps what these risks that are there might exclude them from additional consideration. Perhaps maybe they can consider other military sites. I know there are more military sites around the United States who are kept far from other public or residential areas. Potentially they could use some of the empty locations that

AC-1

AE-1

Commentor No. 164: David Foss (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

they use to store amunition and what not, and maybe use those for the storage of the items. You can take that down as another alternative. AE-1 (cont'd.)

There is also the financial concerns here. I don't know we have talked about the ecological health risks, but we haven't talked about the financial impact. How is that going to impact us financially by removing the mercury from here? Do we use a government subsidary? Do we pay, as taxpayers, to move this stuff? How does that impact us financially to either keep this stuff here, bring more stuff here, or remove it? That is something I would like to learn very quickly because that impacts us financially here for moving consolidation. CB-1 CB-3

It also impacts us indirectly for housing markets. As this town continues to grow how is that going to be viewed by other potential businesses or residents who want to move to this area and look at it and potentially say no we don't want to live there because of the potential health hazards. That begins a snow ball effect of reducing the overall value of our property. I want to make sure that is something taken into consideration. SE-2

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. With

Commentor No. 165: Hillsborough Township Committee
Sonya Martin (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting)

1 respect to the question or two that you have
2 asked perhaps after the oral comment period is
3 over we can get some answers to those questions.
4 Our next speaker is Sonya Martin. She will be
5 followed by Karen McClintock.
6 MS. MARTIN: I am a a township
7 committee woman, and I feel like I have gotten to
8 know most of you very well over the last two
9 years. Certainly we have come a long way from
10 two years ago, when Mayor Tricarico and Committee
11 woman Jenson toured the facility and saw flasks
12 on open pallets with little droplets of mercury.
13 Today as a result of the efforts that you have
14 put out as well as the support and pressure
15 placed upon you by the citizens of Hillsborough
16 you have certainly increased the level of
17 protection on the storage of mercury while it is
18 still here for a short time. And I want to
19 emphasize short time. There is no question the
20 over packing has made it safer while it is here.
21 I want to go further to the future. That mercury
22 will be moved from Hillsborough. I have no doubt DM-1
23 in my mind because it defies all logic and common
24 sense to keep it here.
25 My concern is as we move forward. It's

Commentor No. 165: Hillsborough Township Committee
Sonya Martin (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 14

my understanding by the end of this year you would have a final EIS in place and then 30 days after that the director will reach a final decision. That mercury must go. It will go out of Hillsborough. The next step then becomes how do you safely transport it out of here? This is a dense area. That is why we want it out of here.

Now, am I correct in assuming that these flasks are now stored in hazmat drums? Are they now ready for transport by truck or van? And I want to know what steps are going to be taken to make sure that in the transport process it is safely moved from Hillsborough to wherever it is going to go. Because it's got to go through Central Jersey to get out of here. So I want to know, and I hope that we are now looking beyond 2004. Once a new location has been established I think we have a very, very vested interest in making sure that it is safely transported out of here. And I think -- I don't know whether you can specify to that tonight, but certainly I think this township needs to be assured that as it is being moved out it is done in an intelligent and safe manner, and we have

RT-1

RT-1

Esquire Deposition Services
1-800-247-8366

Commentor No. 165: Hillsborough Township Committee Sonya Martin (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 15

some understanding because it would seem that you have would have to coordinate with a lot of organizations in town in terms of law enforcement to be able to move this safely. And am I correct in saying that the timetable, if all goes well, is as I said final EIS by the end of this year, 30 days later a final decision? Once the final decision is made how long will it take in order to plan and organize the transport of these drums out of here?

RT-1 (cont'd.)

PN-4

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Thank you very much for your comment. I would like to now recognize Karen McClintock to be followed by Steven Sireci.

MS. McCLINTOCK: Good evening. My name is, Karen McClintock, and I am here to speak on behalf of Congressman Ferguson. Since Mike was first elected in the year 2000 our office has been working with the Defense Logistics Agency and other officials to get the mercury out of Hillsborough. Getting the mercury out of Hillsborough has been our goal since day one and continues to be our goal. That has not changed. We are excited tonight is here because it means we are one step closer to getting the mercury out

Esquire Deposition Services
1-800-247-8366

Commentor No. 166: Honorable Mike Ferguson (U.S. House of Representatives), Represented by Karen McClintock (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting)

some understanding because it would seem that you have would have to coordinate with a lot of organizations in town in terms of law enforcement to be able to move this safely. And am I correct in saying that the timetable, if all goes well, is as I said final EIS by the end of this year, 30 days later a final decision? Once the final decision is made how long will it take in order to plan and organize the transport of these drums out of here?

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Thank you very much for your comment. I would like to now recognize Karen McClintock to be followed by Steven Sireci.

MS. McCLINTOCK: Good evening. My name is, Karen McClintock, and I am here to speak on behalf of Congressman Ferguson. Since Mike was first elected in the year 2000 our office has been working with the Defense Logistics Agency and other officials to get the mercury out of Hillsborough. Getting the mercury out of Hillsborough has been our goal since day one and continues to be our goal. That has not changed. We are excited tonight is here because it means we are one step closer to getting the mercury out

AC-1

Commentor No. 166: Honorable Mike Ferguson (U.S. House of Representatives), Represented by Karen McClintock (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 16

of Hillsborough. As many of you know the DLA is required by law to consider Hillsborough as a potential site. But sites like Utah and Nevada make more sense because of their population density. The mercury needs to leave Hillsborough, and the bottom line is that it will be leaving Hillsborough. AC-1

I am glad to see there are some residents out tonight and that many of you are fired up, but I am happy to report that Congressman Ferguson is on top of this issue, has been since day one, will continue to be until all of the mercury is out Hillsborough, and the town council will be on top of making sure that it is moved out in the safest manner as possible.

The process is moving forward. Tonight is the next step. The mercury will be leaving Hillsborough. Thank you. AC-1

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Introduce Steven Sireci to be followed by Cindy Klepich.

MR. SERECI: Hello, I am Steven Sereci Deputy Mayor in Hillsborough. I would also like to thank you all for coming tonight, and for having some very pleasant and helpful, and informative staff for all of us to speak to

Esquire Deposition Services
1-800-247-8366

Commentor No. 167: Hillsborough Township
Honorable Steven Sireci (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting)

Page 16

of Hillsborough. As many of you know the DLA is required by law to consider Hillsborough as a potential site. But sites like Utah and Nevada make more sense because of their population density. The mercury needs to leave Hillsborough, and the bottom line is that it will be leaving Hillsborough.

I am glad to see there are some residents out tonight and that many of you are fired up, but I am happy to report that Congressman Ferguson is on top of this issue, has been since day one, will continue to be until all of the mercury is out Hillsborough, and the town council will be on top of making sure that it is moved out in the safest manner as possible.

The process is moving forward. Tonight is the next step. The mercury will be leaving Hillsborough. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Introduce Steven Sireci to be followed by Cindy Klepich.

MR. SERECI: Hello, I am Steven Sereci Deputy Mayor in Hillsborough. I would also like to thank you all for coming tonight, and for having some very pleasant and helpful, and informative staff for all of us to speak to

Esquire Deposition Services
1-800-247-8366

Commentor No. 167: Hillsborough Township
Honorable Steven Sireci (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

before the formal proceedings. It was a very interesting, very good learning experience to talk to them, and I would only say this about the EIS and where we are right now. I think I understand that it was a good decision to come to a consolidated storage site versus the other options, and I understand the reasons for doing so. Now, that we have come to that point it is as obvious as anything can be that the mercury has to leave a town of 35,000 people and a county of over 200,000 people in the most densely populated state in the country, and particularly when you consider, the thing that I was concerned about in my questions before, which is not the sort of every day storage of mercury in its current over packed state, but rather the possibility of an act of nature or a criminal act, or an industrial accident and what the impact would be here versus a place like Hawthorne, Nevada which is a remote desert army base where the groundwater is 800 and 1200 feet below the surface and where they already decommissioning chemical warfare. It seems as they say a no brainer that a site like that with wide open space with nobody living there, guarded

AP-1

AC-1

Commentor No. 167: Hillsborough Township
Honorable Steven Sireci (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

by the army and already containing more dangerous chemicals than mercury, talking about chemical weapons, would be an obvious place to put this material and that the least likely place to keep it would be here. AC-1 (cont'd.)

So I would have to agree that given the quality of the people I have spoken to tonight that there is no way that you would ever reach a decision to keep the mercury here, and I look forward to its removal to a far more logical storage location, and it's safely removed as well. Thank you. DM-1

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. The next speaker is Cindy Klepich. She will be followed by John Souren.

MS. KLEPICH: Good evening. My name is Cindy Klepich, and I am a resident of Hillsborough, New Jersey. I would also like to thank you for coming here tonight, spending your precious time listening to our comments. I know that you put a lot of thought and hard work into your report. I read the reports two months ago. I assume there is no changes since that report was put out there. It was a very thorough and well done job. I understand how much work it

Commentor No. 168: Cindy Klepich (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting)

by the army and already containing more dangerous chemicals than mercury, talking about chemical weapons, would be an obvious place to put this material and that the least likely place to keep it would be here.

So I would have to agree that given the quality of the people I have spoken to tonight that there is no way that you would ever reach a decision to keep the mercury here, and I look forward to its removal to a far more logical storage location, and it's safely removed as well. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. The next speaker is Cindy Klepich. She will be followed by John Souren.

MS. KLEPICH: Good evening. My name is Cindy Klepich, and I am a resident of Hillsborough, New Jersey. I would also like to thank you for coming here tonight, spending your precious time listening to our comments. I know that you put a lot of thought and hard work into your report. I read the reports two months ago. I assume there is no changes since that report was put out there. It was a very thorough and well done job. I understand how much work it

Commentor No. 168: Cindy Klepich (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

took for you to not only do the research, but to get all the approvals you need and cross checks in order to publish that data. So thank you. The one thing that confuses me in that report, and it is also summarized in the summary report, is ES.4 which our deputy mayor did refer to. As I read the summary and as I read the detailed data describing the risk impact of the different locations the general summary is all sites are about equal in terms of risk. In the summary report it does talk about, you talk about -- for example having more moderate risk categories than we do which is hard to understand. Many people have come forward and spoken about the density of population here. And truly I am sure as you have been around here today you have noticed that. Many of you probably live in the Washington D.C. area and we probably rival that in terms of density of population. I know that you have many regulations that allow you to protect the mercury from normal circumstances, and I am sure you do a mighty fine job of that. I am sure you have many agencies that audited and cross checked you to ensure that that is the case. I know our biggest concern is number one, accidental exposure which

AG-1

RA-1

Commentor No. 168: Cindy Klepich (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 20

was mentioned earlier and certainly anybody who is from the Washington, D.C. area can appreciate what we in the New York metropolitan area went through from September 11th. The best laid plans were foiled, right? People that had malice and forethought came to this area and created horrible acts that impacted everybody here. So you have to understand that everybody sitting here, everybody who will watch a broadcast of this has that in their mind every day when they get up, every night when they go to bed. So it's the thought that if you could potentially consolidate very dangerous material here and people who do not have the best interest, not only the people in our country, the people in this area or of themselves at heart, that there are for a different cause and they could come through although you could do an incredible job of trying to protect this mercury and protect us if a terrorist wants to get through they will get through. I worked for the department of defense. I know that it is true. So I think that is really the concern to put it in an area that presents less of a risk to the general population. You will never be able to put it in

RA-1 (cont'd.)

AC-1

Esquire Deposition Services
1-800-247-8366

Commentor No. 168: Cindy Klepich (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 21

1 an area that has no risk, but certainly have some
2 consideration of the people in this area, the
3 density, because if an accident did happen it
4 would effect a great number of people.
5 Thank you.
6 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. My next
7 speaker is John Souren. He will be followed by
8 Matt Westgate.
9 MR. SOUREN: My name is John Souren. I
10 am a current member of the Hillsborough Township
11 Committee. I want to thank you all for coming
12 here, and for all the information that we
13 received up to this point including a very nice
14 tour by Jim and our chief of police, really gave
15 us information as to the situation there and
16 briefed myself and the deputy mayor as to these
17 situations and how everything was packed and how
18 it was being dealt with.
19 I want to -- I will be brief. I want
20 to make sure there is enough time for everybody
21 else to speak since a lot of the things that have
22 already been said are things I would have said.
23 So I want to say I agree with everything that has
24 been said tonight that it should be moved out of
25 Hillsborough. Some of the main reasons I would

AC-1 (cont'd.)

Esquire Deposition Services
1-800-247-8366

Commentor No. 169: Hillsborough Township Committee John Souren (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting)

Page 21

an area that has no risk, but certainly have some consideration of the people in this area, the density, because if an accident did happen it would effect a great number of people.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. My next speaker is John Souren. He will be followed by Matt Westgate.

MR. SOUREN: My name is John Souren. I am a current member of the Hillsborough Township Committee. I want to thank you all for coming here, and for all the information that we received up to this point including a very nice tour by Jim and our chief of police, really gave us information as to the situation there and briefed myself and the deputy mayor as to these situations and how everything was packed and how it was being dealt with.

I want to -- I will be brief. I want to make sure there is enough time for everybody else to speak since a lot of the things that have already been said are things I would have said. So I want to say I agree with everything that has been said tonight that it should be moved out of Hillsborough. Some of the main reasons I would AC-1

Esquire Deposition Services
1-800-247-8366

Commentor No. 169: Hillsborough Township Committee
John Souren (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 22

like to echo that Hillsborough is a very densely populated town. It has changed dramatically in the last 50, 40, 30 even 10 years ago. Hillsborough 10 years ago is dramatically different than it is today from a population standpoint. This town is also -- even if you look outside of Hillsborough there are many densely populated towns all around us. It is the most densely populated state in the country and when I looked at lists of the other sites and looked at some maps and looked at some of the data and some of the sites were not a very densely populated area, and also on military bases. But a concern I had was I was happy there was some security at the facility here in Hillsborough, but having been in a lot of military bases I know the security on a military base is much more high. So the opportunity for some type of terrorist act would be lower.

AC-1 (cont'd.)

And now to kind of echo on the previous speaker as I understand when she mentioned about if it was in a place that was less desirable,I think one of the problems we have are living in this area is, you know, terrorists could very easily strike. Out of the many different places

RA-2

Esquire Deposition Services
1-800-247-8366

Commentor No. 169: Hillsborough Township Committee John Souren (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

over the country this is a very desirable place to strike especially where the impact would be so great. If there was some type of an attack, if it was somewhere in Nevada, in a military base, where it is less likely to be attacked because of security it is also a less likely target. People are less interested. If there is nothing there it is not going to be as big of an impact on the population of the environment. RA-2 (cont'd.)

And also one other comment I wanted to make, from the tour Jim had said in showing us how it was packed, the state is actually ready to remove it. The state, whatever the regulations are, the government are all ready. So I would like to see it be in that state and get out of this state. AC-1

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. My next speaker is Matt Westgate. He will be followed by Steve Shimshock.

MR. WESTGATE: I just realized there is a lot more detail, a lot more information that I haven't really processed yet. I want to submit my comments in writing. I did have some questions about the schedule of process.

Commentor No. 170: Dr. Steve Shimshock (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting)

Page 24

MR. LAWSON: If you can hang on they can be asked later on.

MR. WESTGATE: Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Steve Shimshock, and he will be followed by I think I have got this right Victor Fabricatori, is that close?

MR. SIMSHAW: Yes, I am Steve Shimshock. I am a Ph.D. chemist and I am -- quite frankly I am astounded that Hillsborough is even considered as one of the sites for consolidating the mercury seeing that how densely populated it is, and how close to water sources it is. But also I wanted to emphasize what one of the other speakers said that mercury is only part of the problem. You still have a lot of toxic heavy metals there. I think of the mercury as only the tip of the iceberg. I would like to see most, if not all of the heavy metals that are stored there eventually removed. I question the strategy of consolidating such high amounts of material. I would much rather prefer that the mercury be sold in the open market, but I understand that that's not considered an option. But I -- and also on behalf of the security issue my opinion is that this should really be stored

AC-1

OS-3

AS-1

AE-1

Esquire Deposition Services
1-800-247-8366

Commentor No. 170: Dr. Steve Shimshock (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 25

AE-1 (cont'd.)

at a military base with a lot more security.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Victor Fabricatori. Anybody close to that name? How about Dan Wartenberg? Mr. Wartenberg is the last person I have on my list. Is there anybody, by a show of hands, that would like to speak afterwards? I have a couple of others. I will take you after he is finished.

MR. WARTENBURG: Thank you. My name is Dan Wartenburg. I am a professor of environmental epidemiology at the Robert Wood Johnson Medical School in Piscataway. I am a member of the Montgomery Township Volunteer Fire Company, Number Two. I am a member of the Somerset County Hazmat Team and Montgomery Board of Health. And I met several of you at the previous meetings. When I first visited the site and spoke with you -- I first visited the site and spoke with you in 2000. At that time as a public health professional it seemed to me it didn't make any sense to be keeping this amount of mercury, this quality of mercury which is a very highly toxic material in this very populated area. At that time some colleaques and I raised some concerns about a scenario, our suggestions

Esquire Deposition Services
1-800-247-8366

Commentor No. 171: Dan Wartenberg (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting)

Page 25

at a military base with a lot more security.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Victor Fabricatori. Anybody close to that name? How about Dan Wartenberg? Mr. Wartenberg is the last person I have on my list. Is there anybody, by a show of hands, that would like to speak afterwards? I have a couple of others. I will take you after he is finished.

MR. WARTENBURG: Thank you. My name is Dan Wartenburg. I am a professor of environmental epidemiology at the Robert Wood Johnson Medical School in Piscataway. I am a member of the Montgomery Township Volunteer Fire Company, Number Two. I am a member of the Somerset County Hazmat Team and Montgomery Board of Health. And I met several of you at the previous meetings. When I first visited the site and spoke with you -- I first visited the site and spoke with you in 2000. At that time as a public health professional it seemed to me it didn't make any sense to be keeping this amount of mercury, this quality of mercury which is a very highly toxic material in this very populated area. At that time some colleaques and I raised some concerns about a scenario, our suggestions

AC-1

Esquire Deposition Services
1-800-247-8366

Commentor No. 171: Dan Wartenberg (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 26

weren't taken real seriously. I think that now that it's -- we are in the past 9-11 era those sorts of issues are taken much more seriously because we all have a new perspective. I think now it is two and a half years later from my first visit there, I am quite concerned that despite many promises it seems you still have no final plan. I just can't understand what is taking so long. It is really incomprehensible. In an industrial plan for managing and possible transport of this material I think it is also unfortunate you haven't taken more advantage of the resources we have here in the Somerset County area of New Jersey. We have lots of local experts and residents who are concerned about this, want to know more about it, want to do what they can do. You have some of the worlds experts in risk assessment, hazardous waste, public health, chemistry, you heard from some here tonight, and I think if you had taken advantage of these folks it really could help you better understand how the mercury might impact the local community because they live here and they really know what it is like.

As an outsider, no matter how much time

AC-1 (cont'd.)

NP-5

NP-3

Esquire Deposition Services
1-800-247-8366

Commentor No. 171: Dan Wartenberg (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 27

you put in it there is always a different story. NP-3 (cont'd.)
I think it's really high time to transport the mercury, and all the other hazardous materials that are at the depot out of Hillsborough. It's long overdue. I really urge you to act quickly AC-1 and to act safely, and help and better protect the health and safety of Somerset County residents.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Okay I saw at least two hands. I will start with this lady right here. I don't have your name. If you could give it to me so I could write it down.

MS. DIAN: My name is Julia Dian. I was not going to be a speaker, but after listening to some of the comments and the presentation I have some concerns. When I walked into the presentation outside I looked at the Lake Developement of New York that was on the map and that's also in the brochure here, and when I asked was that one of the consolidation sites I was told that was no longer a consolidation site, and I asked why they told me based on the growth and the business plan that was no longer a consolidation site. Hillsborough has tremendously grown in the last couple of years.

Esquire Deposition Services
1-800-247-8366

Commentor No. 172: Julia Dian (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting)

you put in it there is always a different story. I think it's really high time to transport the mercury, and all the other hazardous materials that are at the depot out of Hillsborough. It's long overdue. I really urge you to act quickly and to act safely, and help and better protect the health and safety of Somerset County residents.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Okay I saw at least two hands. I will start with this lady right here. I don't have your name. If you could give it to me so I could write it down.

MS. DIAN: My name is Julia Dian. I was not going to be a speaker, but after listening to some of the comments and the presentation I have some concerns. When I walked into the presentation outside I looked at the Lake Developement of New York that was on the map and that's also in the brochure here, and when I asked was that one of the consolidation sites I was told that was no longer a consolidation site, and I asked why they told me based on the growth and the business plan that was no longer a consolidation site. Hillsborough has tremendously grown in the last couple of years.

AC-3

AC-1

Commentor No. 172: Julia Dian (Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Meeting) (continued)

More so than ever. We have all these businesses. I myself have my family plus my daughter's, we encouraged her to buy her home here, she has her family, my grandchildren, and I consider Hillsborough a very productive and a very viable community. Not only for now, but for the future. We have our children to think of and all the health potential hazards that are associated with mercury. As a registered nurse myself I have tremendous concerns for that and I ask that you consider this site to be closed, to please consider a site that is not as densely populated as Hillsborough, and I thank you for listening. AC-1 (cont'd.) AC-1

MR. LAWSON: Thank you for coming. Now did I not see another hand? Please come up.

MRS. ZAKALUK: I am Marie Zakaluk. In addition to the fact that we are very populated I would like to add two other aspects. This community is one of the few places in the United States that is more than 200 years old, older than the United States itself. We have quite a heritage that could easily be destroyed. That's number one. American heritage no one has mentioned that. We love our children, we love our homes, but we also love our country. When we

Commentor No. 173: Charles Kratovil

From the MM EIS Web site–

Being a resident of Hillsborough and having attended the public meeting you held at my high school, I would like to apologize for the decorum of my fellow residents at that meeting. While they deserved the right to voice their concerns and opinions, many of them were downright rude to the very people who came to hear them out. The fact is that, by all reliable accounts, the mercury currently stored at the Hillsborough Depot is being stored safely and poses no threat or hazard to the community or the people working there if everything remains as it is. However, out of the many potential hazards of storing the mercury in our town, the only legitimate health hazard to our residents is from that of a natural disaster. The threats of terrorist attacks on the depot and plane crashes in the area are both bogus excuses to get the mercury out of our town. Many argued that night that Hillsborough is too densely populated to store any mercury, with one resident even saying that our population density "probably rivals [Washington, D.C]," making it an excellent target for terrorism if the mercury is consolidated here. While Hillsborough has become a much more populated town than it once was, it is in no way populated enough to be a target for any significant terrorist action, no matter how much mercury is stored within its borders. It is also interesting to note that Hillsborough is approximately 57 square miles, making it the largest township in Somerset County, and thus spreading out the supposedly dense population even more. Furthermore, while the hazardous effects of mercury on human beings are certainly not wonderful, the threat they pose was not accurately grasped by many of the speakers at the meeting. Many of them said that after a natural disaster or terrorist attack at the depot, our township's residents could become "infected," as if exposure to mercury is some sort of contagious disease that makes people fall ill and die within weeks. What is in fact true is that heavy exposure to mercury over long periods of time can cause health problems much later in life. If in fact there was a disaster that exposed the town to mercury and its vapors, an evacuation would likely be made of the surrounding area until the mess could be cleaned and the vapors released diffused throughout the atmosphere. While this is not a pleasant scenario, it is probably one that would result in very little (likely none) adverse effects from the exposure, unless residents inexplicably began bathing themselves in the mercury for weeks after the disaster. Additionally, in my humble opinion, the adverse effects of whatever disaster brought about the exposure (hurricane, tornado, the very likely terrorist attack, etc.) would be far worse and prove to be the true concern of Hillsborough at the time. Additionally, the supposed danger of a plane crash in the vicinity of the depot setting off this change of events suggested at the meeting by our town's police chief was downright ridiculous when you think about it. The chances of a plane crashing into the depot itself is about as likely as mercury becoming a hot commodity again. We are talking about astronomical odds not even worthy of discussion here. Not to mention that plane crashes are much more likely at the consolidation site favored by many of the meeting's attendees, an Air Force base. I do not have much knowledge as to the other facilities being considered for consolidation and I will leave it up to you to investigate them. The bottom line is that consolidation seems to be the best solution and the mercury will have to end up somewhere. If you find that Hillsborough seems to be the best storage facility, it is in our nation's interests to move it here. And it is our duty as Americans to "take one for the team" and store the mercury in our state-of-the-art facility. However, my fellow residents seem to be not so keen on "taking one for the team" and will likely need to be persuaded to avoid an uproar. If you deem the Hillsborough site the best for the mercury, I feel the best way to ease tensions

AC-1

OS-1

Commentor No. 173: Charles Kratovil (continued)

with the town would involve: 1) a guarantee of improved and exemplary full-time security of the facility 2) issuing public reports on escaping vapors and making them available online 3) the DNSC taking responsibility for anything that may go wrong 4) a promise to remove it if the depot cannot continue storing the mercury safely 5) monetary compensation to the township. Hillsborough is a town that has had its school board's budget defeated solidly for the past two years and recent tax hikes provoked over 700 people to attend a recent Township Committee meeting. Hillsborough is a community strapped for cash and compensation could help kill one of our birds with one of your stones, while we kill one of yours with one of ours. Thank you for all of the hard work you have done.

OS-1 (cont'd.)

Commentor No. 174: Quicksilver Caucus
Karen L. Smith et al.

July 15, 2003

Attention: Project Manager
Mercury Management EIS
DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Dear Sir or Madam:

The purpose of this correspondence is to provide the Defense National Stockpile Center (DNSC) with comments regarding the Draft Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), announced in the *Federal Register* on April 11, 2003 (68 FR 17787) on behalf of the Quicksilver Caucus (QSC), a coalition of State associations formed to address and resolve health and environmental problems resulting from the release of mercury to the environment. The membership of the QSC includes the Environmental Council of the States, The Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials, The State and Territorial Air Pollution Program Administrators, The Association of Local Air Pollution Control Officials, The Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators, The Association of State Drinking Water Administrators.

The following comments represent consensus views of the QSC regarding the overall directions presented by the EIS, and are summary in nature. Individual associations of the caucus, or individual States may address specific, programmatic or locational issues in separate comments. We urge the DNSC to consider those comments with great attention, as they will represent the views of program experts and those who would be most directly involved with implementation of your selected course of action.

First, we commend DNSC for its diligence and attention to detail in producing this draft EIS document. Also, we wish to thank you for your willingness to discuss the issues and to inform members and guests of our organizations in numerous briefings and meetings over the past two years. Your organizational attitude has been consistently open and positive.

Regarding the final alternatives you present, we agree that sales should not be adopted as a solution in any of the alternative forms you examined. The international controls on mercury are inadequate to protect the global population in general, and the United States homeland in particular, from continuing releases and atmospheric deposition to our waters that eventually will affect our wildlife and our citizens. Even efforts to use these excess stocks as offsets for suspended mining cannot be guaranteed with any certainty. The discussions of risks of the sales option at Sections 4.4 and 4.5 do not appear to recognize the weakness of the current international management system that allows continuing releases to the environment, and the contradictions of options that would see the United States contribute to those continuing mercury releases are too obvious to be acceptable. We continue to strongly oppose this option. AS-1

We can support either of the other two options presented, retaining existing storage locations and consolidating storage in a single location, as long as the storage is safe, fully resourced by the federal government to maintain those safe storage standards, and most importantly, has been PO-1

Commentor No. 174: Quicksilver Caucus
Karen L. Smith et al. (continued)

accepted and agreed to by the State(s) and community (-ies) concerned. If there has been complete and open consultation on the part of DoD and its components, and acceptance by the governments representing the storage location(s), we are prepared to accept either option.

PO-1 (cont'd.)

Beyond the fundamental issue of safety, the agreement of those governments directly involved with the storage location, whether those are new locations or existing locations, is the deciding factor to us in your final selection between these two options. The rather cursory description of requirements for consultation in Section 5.3 strikes us as inadequate to achieve the level of buy-in we think is necessary, and we recommend that you expand the EIS discussion elsewhere to describe the ways DoD and its elements would consult with, establish conditions, and gain agreement of State and local governments to the details of storage site locations. We do not disagree with your preference for consolidation. We see the obvious economic benefits of scale and the promise of some improved storage technology in consolidated storage, although there are probably some disadvantages inherent in the handling, cross-country ground transportation, and the security challenge such a consolidation would involve.

AC-1

We are submitting for the docket record, four draft stewardship documents completed by the QSC in February 2003, and we would urge DNSC to review these closely for their bearing on the selection of a final option and the subsequent implementation planning that must follow. The Best Management Practices and Options for Storage of Mercury will be useful in preparing for the no change or consolidation options. You will find that the remaining two documents, Analysis of Mercury Market Policy Options and Review of Mercury Commodity Markets, support our judgment that the sales option is unacceptable.

RP-1

Thank you for your cooperation and outreach throughout the EIS development process, and for this opportunity to provide our consensus comments on this final draft. We look forward to continuing to work with you as the Department of Defense decision is implemented.

Sincerely yours,

ASIWPCA

Karen L. Smith, ASIWPCA President, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality

Jennifer Kaduck (KL) Association of State and Territorial ASTSWMO Solid Waste Management Officials

Jennifer Kaduck, ASTSWMO President, Georgia Department of Natural Resources

Lloyd L. Eagan Cory R. Chadwick STAPPA / ALAPCO

Lloyd Eagan, STAPPA President, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Cory R. Chadwick, ALAPCO President, Hamilton County, Ohio, Department of Environmental Services

ECOS

Ronald F. Hammerschmidt, Past President, Kansas Department of Health and Environment

Enclosures

Commentor No. 175: Dale and Joan Hermann

July 4, 2003

Dale and Joan Hermann
15514 Gar Creek Road
New Haven, Indiana 46774

Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060-6223

RE: CASAD Depot and Mercury Stockpile

We attended the meeting in New Haven on May 20, 2003. As with most Americans each day is filled with just earning a living and taking care of family and home, but with the deadline date for comments almost here, we have tried to quickly address some of our deep concerns resulting from stockpiling hazardous mercury in our neighborhood and close to the cities of New Haven and Fort Wayne. For most of us, our homes are the most valuable asset we own. A mercury stockpile will be devastating not only to the home and business owners close to CASAD, but to the entire Fort Wayne area with a population of over 330,000. No matter the rhetoric, when people learn a large stockpile of mercury is stored in Allen County, businesses and people will look elsewhere to locate, and this economy will be seriously damaged. In years past the city of New Haven spent large amounts of money to stop the expansion of a chemical waste dump near the community. Now our government is considering it for a hazardous material dumping ground. We are not asking the US government to give us anything. We're asking you not to bring harm to us. **SE-2**

The community of Gar Creek where we live, is closest to the CASAD. It has a wonderful history. The people are honest, hard working, and self sustaining. People have farmed the land, built businesses, remodeled older homes, built new ones, etc. **We trusted and planed our future** with the understanding the CASAD Depot would be closed in 2015. It has been devastating to hear that our government is now considering canceling the closing and **adding** even more hazardous material to the stockpiling in this "WWII vintage, CASAD Depot". Like many other Americans, the people of this area have contributed to our countries strength, and we are asking our government not to OK a decision that will cause us to loose much of what we have worked generations to build. **PN-1**

Is it true that mercury is actually being imported into the U S by private industry? Why don't we sell our excess and make money instead of spending money to store it? This is a win, win option. If concerns are unstable trade and/or world market problems that could be worked out - if it is considered a priority. Or is "easiest solution" the priority? **AS-1**

We have been told the cost of storing the mercury stockpile at the CASAD would be less than any of the other sights being considered. Is that because CASAD is government owned and the others are privately owned? Do the other sights have higher quality facilities and are consequently more secure? That would legitimize a higher cost. Is a private facility held to a different (higher) level of liability for accidents? That also would be a reason for increased costs. What are the priorities when spending our tax dollars? Most citizens seriously wonder. We do believe cost effectiveness is very important, but the safety and the economic protection of people should be most important. **CB-1**

We have not even addressed the **very serious environmental concerns** for 330,00 people. Terrorist threats, vandals, tornadoes, the underground rivers in our area are only a few.. There are many concerns and they **are legitimate**. **RA-1** **EC-1**

It was a poignant moment when watching a local TV station interview Essie Schloss, a DNSC representative at the meeting. She was asked whether or not she would be concerned if this was happening close to her house. She answered, "I would have absolutely no problem or concerns. It is perfectly safe and will not affect the community." Then she boarded her airplane and flew away - far away from CASAD Depot.

Thank you for reading this letter. Your decision is of monumental importance to this area of Indiana!

Dale Hermann Joan Hermann

Commentor No. 176: Maxine R. Zaslow

11 Dorchester Ct.
Hillsborough, N.J. 08844

Project Manager
Mercury Management EIS
DNSC-E
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060

July 15th, 2003

Dear Sir:

Enclosed is a petition signed by voting-age residents of the State of New Jersey asking for immediate removal of all the mercury stored in Hillsborough by the Defense Logistics Agency. Most of the people who signed the petition are residents of either Hillsborough or nearby towns. The few people who signed the petition—and do not live in or near Hillsborough—either own a business here, work here or have close relatives living here. All who signed spend a considerable amount of time in Hillsborough; and, therefore, they are very concerned about this matter. AC-1

Hillsborough's mayor — Tony Gwiazdowski — helped me to get a good start circulating the enclosed petition. I am grateful for his encouragement and support.

I hope this petition will demonstrate that there is much support for getting the mercury out of Hillsborough now. The people here are anxiously awaiting your decision. AC-1

Very truly yours,
Maxine R. Zaslow

Commentor No. 177: Walker River Paiute Tribe
Honorable Victoria Guzman

Walker River Paiute Tribe

P.O. Box 220 • Schurz, Nevada 89427
Phone: (775) 773-2306
FAX: (775) 773-2585

July 14, 2003

Dennis Lynch
Mercury Management EIS, DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Mr. Lynch

In response to the draft EIS Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement, we are requesting formal consultation for proper government to government relations.

In the case of *United States and the Walker River Paiute Tribe, et al. v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co.*, we feel you would be in violation of this settlement if mercury were transported through or Reservation. It is our understanding that the rail line through our Reservation is for the Army to transport munitions and not for the transportation of mercury for storage. EP-2

Further, we could not find in the EIS specific impacts discussed if mercury were transported through our Reservation via rail or truck. This is a severe oversight if transportation routes are considered through our Reservation. It was quite alarming to see in the EIS that in some situations, there is a "moderate" chance for rail or truck accidents. RT-3

Please feel free to call me to schedule a time for you to meet here in Schurz, NV for formal government to government consultation as required by federal law and executive order to discuss your draft EIS.

Sincerely,

Victoria Guzman

Victoria Guzman, Tribal Chairperson
WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE

Commentor No. 178: Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation John A. Owsley

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION
DOE OVERSIGHT DIVISION
761 EMORY VALLEY ROAD
OAK RIDGE, TENNESSEE 37830-7072

July 11, 2003

Attention: Project Manager
MM EIS, DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Long-Term Management of the Defense National Stockpile Center (DNSC) Excess Elemental Mercury.

Dear Sir or Madam

The Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, DOE Oversight Division (TDEC/DOE-O) has reviewed the above subject document in an accordance with the requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and associated regulations of 40 CFR 1500-1508 and 10 CFR 1021 as implemented.

General Comment

The state of Tennessee concurs with the DNSC preferred alternative of consolidated mercury storage at one site. The DNSC consolidation sites analysis of six sites presently excludes Oak Ridge Y-12 as a potential storage site. AP-1

If you have any questions concerning these comments, please contact me at (865) 481-0995.

Sincerely

John A. Owsley
Director

xc: Alan Leiserson, TDEC – OGC
Dodd Galbreath, TDEC – EPO

Jao710.99

Commentor No. 179: Allison Van Zandt

1300 S. Harrison St., RM 3158
Fort Wayne, IN
46802

03 JUN 13 PM 1:28

Senator Lugar,

I am very concerned about the possibility of the national Mercury stockpile being stored at the Cesad Depot in New Haven, Indiana. Allen County takes great pride in our water resources, and this stockpile would be a threat to our wellbeing and community pride. AC-1

Our government agencies (such as the Soil + Water Conservation District and Solid Waste Mgmt. District) have educated our community about the hazards of Mercury. It would be a shame to learn that we have to do everything we can to protect our water resources, only to have the government threaten them so greatly. WR-1

Our county is much to large + concerned to allow this Mercury stockpile in our backyard. Please work toward stopping this! AC-1

Sincerely,

Allison Van Zandt

Commentor No. 180: City of New Haven
Honorable Terry E. McDonald

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
CITY OF NEW HAVEN
P.O. Box 570
815 Lincoln Highway East
New Haven, Indiana 46774
(260) 748-7070 (260) 748-7075 Fax
www.newhavenin.org

July 14, 2003

Mr. Cornel Holder, Administrator
Department of National Stockpile Center
8725 John F. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Dear Mr. Holder:

I am writing to you today with respect to the Mercury Management Environmental Impact Study and the possibility of the national stockpile of mercury being placed at the New Haven Depot.

I cannot emphasize enough how much harm this would do to our local economic development efforts by bringing the mercury to our area. The area between the New Haven corporate limits and New Haven Depot has been designated as an area for future industrial growth. It has also been the long time dream of our community to reclaim the New Haven Depot area for an industrial development park. In a time of economic downturn, such an industrial park would mean new jobs, new tax dollars and new vitality to our community. In the event that the mercury is stored at the New Haven Depot, all of the above would not be possible. SE-2 SE-1

The storage of the national stockpile of mercury has no economic advantage to our community, rather, the stockpile is a liability to our emergency services and economic growth. Furthermore, the stockpile is a potential hazard to both the health and welfare of 337,000 and growing population. It does not make any sense to stockpile the mercury is such a densely populated area of the country when lesser densely populated localities exist. AC-1

As the Mayor of New Haven, Indiana, I hereby request the Defense National Stockpile Center to remove New Haven, Indiana from consideration as the consolidation site for the national stockpile of mercury.

Thank you for your time and serious consideration in this most important matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (260) 748-7070.

Respectfully,

Terry E. McDonald
Mayor
City of New Haven

cc: File
holder.wpd

"Equal Opportunity Employer"

Commentor No. 181: United States Senate
Honorable Richard G. Lugar

RICHARD G. LUGAR
INDIANA

306 HART SENATE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20510
202-224-4814

senator_lugar@lugar.senate.gov

COMMITTEES:
FOREIGN RELATIONS, CHAIRMAN
AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510–1401

July 7, 2003

Richard J. Connelly, Administrator
Defense National Stockpile Center
8575 John J. Kingman Road, Room 4528
Ft. Belvoir, Virgiana 22060-6223

Dear Mr. Connelly:

I enclose copies of correspondence that I received from my constituents expressing concern about a proposal to use the Casad Depot facility in New Haven, Indiana for storage of all the Defense Department's supply of mercury. PP-2

I would appreciate your review of these comments. Any information you can provide me about the rationale for the Defense Department plans would be appreciated.

You may direct your response to Mr. Lane Ralph of my staff at 10 West Market Street, Suite 1180, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2964. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Richard G. Lugar
United States Senator

RGL/lar
cc: Phil Shaull, Director, Northeast Senate Office, Fort Wayne

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

Commentor No. 182: Fort Wayne Common Council
Honorable John N. Crawford et al.

THE CITY OF FORT WAYNE
MEMBER OF THE COMMON COUNCIL
ONE MAIN STREET • ROOM 122 • FORT WAYNE, INDIANA 46802 • 219-427-1221 • FAX 219-427-1371

May 27, 2003

Mayor Terry McDonald
New Haven City Councilmembers
815 Lincoln Highway
New Haven, Indiana 46774

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

WHEREAS, the United States Defense Logistics Agency desires to consolidate its stockpiles of mercury at a single, central location; and,

WHEREAS, the Defense Logistics Agency is considering its New Haven Depot (formerly Casad Depot) as a potential site for this central stockpile; and,

WHEREAS, mercury is a virulent poison that must be stored with absolute commitment to preventing release into the environment; and, SB-1

WHEREAS, a large stockpile of such poisonous material, in a single place, would create an unmanageable burden on the local community in the event of an accident or disaster, natural or manmade, that caused a release of the substance; and, RA-1

WHEREAS, the storage of hundreds of tons of such a toxic material would create great community upset and concern without any positive impact on the community, SE-2

And, whereas the New Haven City Council has resolved that a consolidated mercury stockpile should not be located at the New Haven Depot,

The undersigned members of the Fort Wayne Common Council oppose the location of a consolidated mercury stockpile at the New Haven Depot and request that the Defense Logistics Agency eliminate the New Haven Depot from consideration for any future consolidation of its mercury inventory. AC-1

John N. Crawford, President

Rebecca J. Ravine, Vice-President

Thomas E. Smith, District One

Donald J. Schmidt, District Two

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

Commentor No. 182: Fort Wayne Common Council
Honorable John N. Crawford et al. (continued)

Page Two
Mayor/Council
Mercury stockpile

Thomas C. Henry, District Three

Thomas E. Hayhurst, District Four

Timothy M. Pape, District Five

Glynn A. Hines, District Six

Samuel J. Talarico, At-large

Commentor No. 183: Petition: Remove all Mercury Stored in Hillsborough, New Jersey

AC-1
DM-3

WE , BY OUR SIGNATURES BELOW, ARE REQUESTING THAT THE DEFENSE LOGISTIC AGENCY, HAVE THE MERCURY THAT IS STORED IN HILLSBOROUGH NEW JERSEY REMOVED .

NAME	ADDRESS	TOWN	STATE	PHONE #	EMAIL	SIGNATURE
1. Maxine Zaslow	11 Dorchester Cr.	Hillsborough	N.J	(908)359-3485		Maxine Zaslow
2. Nicky Chromansky						
3. Debbie Butler						
4. Glenna Lerner	15 [illegible] Court	[illegible]	N.J.	[illegible]		Glenna Lerner
5. Joann Ruben	2 Regina Dr.	Hillsborough	NJ	908 359-5376		
6. Mary Butcher	665 B Dover Ct	Hillsborough	NJ	908 4008362		
7. Mur Kasuwrator	2807 Balmoral Ct	Hillsborough	NJ	908 281-0019		
8. Jormuese Ifan	43 White Meadow Road	Hillsborough	NJ	(908)281-7354		
9. Len Del Vecchio	18th Merry Lane	Hillsborough		908 3599171		Len Del Vecchio
10. Marge Del Vecchio	184 Merry Lane	Hillsborough		908 3599171		Marguerite Del Vecchio
11. Carlos Zamora	9 Farm Rd	RR# 126	Hillsborough	N.J		876-62-93
12. Karla Samora	9 Farm Rd.	RR II 127.				876-6293
13. Samantha Fagen	3002 Revere Ct.	Hillsborough	NJ	08844	(908)359-7469 samfagen@hotmail.net	Samantha Fagen
14. BRIDGET WILLIAMS	327 TALLOAK LN.	HILLSBOROUGH	NJ	08844		Bridget Williams
15. THOMAS R CRONIN	6 LORIEN PL.	HILLSBOROUGH	NJ	08844		Thomas R Cronin
16. Heather Cronin	6 Lorien Place	Hillsborough.				H. Cronin.
17. Kimberly Wright	10 Banor Dr.	Hillsborough	NJ	08844		Kim Wright
18. Vanessa Kaplan	31 Dorchester Court	Hillsborough	NJ	08844		
19. Kevin Seibert	27 Elmendorf Cr.	Hillsborough	NJ	08844		
20. Joe Godby	309 N Greenbrier St	Mazville	NJ	08876		

Commentor No. 184A: Petition: Strong Opposition to Consolidated Mercury Storage at the New Haven Depot—Adult Community Members

AC-1

PETITION IN OPPOSITION TO

The expansion, consolidation and/or storage of additional mercury or any other hazardous materials at the New Haven Depot located in New Haven, Indiana.

*The following signatures represent the adult members of the community in New Haven, and/or adult residents of any other community located within Allen County, Indiana, as we stand united in **strong opposition** to the proposal by the Defense National Stockpile Center regarding the consolidation of mercury at the New Haven Depot in New Haven, Indiana.*

Name	Address of Person Signing Petition
DON KING (Printed Name) / Don King (Signature)	1432 N. PARK DR (Street Address) / New Haven 46774 (City, State, Zip) / 6-3-03 (Date Signed)
BEVERLY DABNEY (Printed Name) / Beverly Dabney (Signature)	6316 MINNICH Rd (Street Address) / NEW HAVEN, IN 46774 (City, State, Zip) / 6-3-03 (Date Signed)
R. Ann Rorick (Printed Name) / R. Ann Rorick (Signature)	1718 Lopshire Dr. (Street Address) / New Haven In. 46774 (City, State, Zip) / 6-3-03 (Date Signed)
JACQUE J. DAWSON (Printed Name) / Jacque J. Dawson (Signature)	1539 E. MacGregor Dr. (Street Address) / New Haven, In. 46774 (City, State, Zip) / (Date Signed)
JOHN W. NORTH (Printed Name) / John W. North (Signature)	1109 BROOKDALE Dr. (Street Address) / NEW HAVEN, IN. 46774 (City, State, Zip) / 6-3-03 (Date Signed)
Wm. DALE McALEXANDER (Printed Name) / Wm Dale McAlexander (Signature)	12021 SPENCERVILLE Rd (Street Address) / HARLAN IN 46743 (City, State, Zip) / June 3, 2003 (Date Signed)
Julie K Ely (Printed Name) / Julie K Ely (Signature)	8131 Roanoke Drive (Street Address) / Fort Wayne In 46835 (City, State, Zip) / June 3, 2003 (Date Signed)

Commentor No. 184B: Petition: Strong Opposition to Consolidated Mercury Storage at the New Haven Depot—Future Leaders of the Community

AC-1

PETITION IN OPPOSITION TO

The expansion, consolidation and/or storage of additional mercury or any other hazardous materials at the New Haven Depot located in New Haven, Indiana.

*As future leaders of our community in New Haven, Indiana, the following signatures represent the youth of our community as we stand united in **strong opposition** to the proposal by the Defense National Stockpile Center regarding the consolidation of mercury at the New Haven Depot in New Haven, Indiana.*

Name	Address of Person Signing Petition
Dennis Kreisher (Printed Name) / Signature	9518 Arrow Pass (Street Address) / New Haven In 46774 (City State Zip) / 6-1-03 (Date Signed)
Joyce A Kreisher (Printed Name) / Signature	9518 Arrow Pass (Street Address) / New Haven IN 46774 (City State Zip) / 6-1-03 (Date Signed)
Cheri Menshy (Printed Name) / Signature	3085 Shawnee Tr. (Street Address) / New Haven In 46774 (City State Zip) / 6-1-03 (Date Signed)
Fred W. Schimmel Jr. (Printed Name) / FRED W. SCHIMMEL JR (Signature)	3079 SHAWNEE TRL (Street Address) / NEW HAVEN IN 46774 (City State Zip) / 6/1/03 (Date Signed)
RUTH ANN SCHIMMEL (Printed Name) / Ruth Ann Schimmel (Signature)	3079 Shawnee Trl. (Street Address) / New Haven, In 46774 (City State Zip) / 6/1/03 (Date Signed)
ERIN SMITH (Printed Name) / Erin Smith (Signature)	3092 Shawnee TRL (Street Address) / New Haven IN 46774 (City State Zip) / 6/1/03 (Date Signed)
Crista Pemberton (Printed Name) / Crista Pemberton (Signature)	3067 Shawnee Tr. (Street Address) / New Haven, IN 46774 (City State Zip) / 6/1/03 (Date Signed)

Commentor No. 185: Traci and Michael Butler

To whom it may concern / project manager,

We are opposed to having Mercury shipped and stored in Utah, especially if it is not generated within UT. Shipping it across several states would place many at unnecessary risk; please instead recondition existing stockpile sites and leave it in the states where Mercury is currently being stored. AC-1 AN-1

Very concerned and opposed to having more toxic materials shipped/stored in Utah, AC-1

Traci and Michael Butler

Commentor No. 186: Lisa Dvorin

From the MM EIS Web site–

I am a resident of Hillsborough for 16 years, and moved there because of the 'clean' environment (i.e., no toxic landfills, no run off or pollutants in water, etc. Hillsborough is a densly populated town, in central New Jersey – an extremely highly populated section of the Country. Most of the excess invenstory, about 2,617 metric tons is stored at the Somerville Depot in Somerville, NJ. Having more than half of the mercury in the US stored in such a highly populated area does not make sense. Get ride of the mercury from Somerville/Hillsborough NJ now! AC-1

Commentor No. 187: Edward Stredney

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name Edward Stredney

Address 728 Lincoln Avenue,

Organization

City Niles State Oh Zip 44446

Phone 330-883-6654

E-mail Address Stredney4@AOL.COM

COMMENTS:

Storing mercury in populated areas such as Warren, Ohio concerns me in case of spills or accidents. The mercury getting into air, land, & water creates major problems. Less populated areas (deserts) be much more appropiate storage facility for mercury. AC-1

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:

Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: *(888) 306-6682*
toll free fax: *(888) 306-8818*
e-mail: *information@mercuryeis.com*
website: *www.mercuryeis.com*

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 188: Lillian C. Jewell

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name LILLIAN C. JEWELL

Address 511 NORTHVIEW Apt. 102

Organization

City GIRARD, OHIO State Zip 44420

Phone 545-6220

E-mail Address

COMMENTS:

I am against mercury as it is for our environmental hazard for our area of Warren, Ohio

AC-1

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: (888) 306-6682
toll free fax: (888) 306-8818
e-mail: information@mercuryeis.com
website: www.mercuryeis.com

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 189: Healthy Environment Alliance of Utah
Jason Groenewold

ADVISORY COUNCIL
Barbara and Norman Tanner
Bishop George Niederauer
Dee Rowland
Ed Firmage
Chip Ward
Terry Tempest Williams
Claire Geddes
Boyer Jarvis
Rev. Dr. Dave Randle
Dr. Vicki Macy
Dr. Lou Borgenicht
Dr. James Lombardo
Dr. Jane Bowman
Howard Gross
Kathy VanDame
Dr. Jerry Lazar
Margene Bullcreek
Mary Dickson
Dr. Kent Staheli
Jim McConkie, esq

PARTICIPATING GROUPS
Citizens Against Radioactive Waste in Utah
Families Against Incinerator Risk
Ohngo Gaudadeh Devia Awareness
Shundahai Network
Utah Legislative Watch
Utah Progressive Network
Women Concerned/ Utahns United

www.healutah.org

HEAL Utah
Healthy Environment ALliance of Utah
68 S. Main St, Suite 400 Salt Lake City, Utah 84101 (801) 355-5055

July 18, 2003

Project Manager
Mercury Management EIS
DNSC-E
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

RE: Draft Mercury Management EIS

To Whom It May Concern:

On behalf of the Healthy Environment Alliance of Utah (HEAL Utah), I would like to submit these comments on the Draft Mercury Management EIS. HEAL Utah is a non-profit grassroots organization that is working to protect the public from the risks of transporting, disposing and storing both nuclear and toxic wastes in Utah.

The first request would be for an extension of time for the public to comment on the Draft EIS. It was only recently brought to our attention that a formal comment period had begun on the DEIS. I am unaware of how the Defense National Stockpile Center attempted to involve and inform the public of this proposal and the related comment periods, but no one from our organization was made aware of the DEIS comment period until an article appeared on July 9, 2003 in the local newspaper. Given that we are on the mailing lists for the Army's chemical weapons destruction program, the Utah Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste, the Utah Division of Radiation Control, and the Utah Division of Air Quality, it would seem that a reasonable attempt to inform the public of this proposal would have been to send a notice to those individuals and organizations who are on these lists. It certainly would give a starting point for those who are generally interested in environmental issues in the state to help spread the word of the comment period and the proposal. We would appreciate it if you extended the comment period by 30-60 days so that those who may just be finding out about these plans can submit timely comments to you. PP-3

Working to Protect the Public from the Risks of Transporting, Storing, and Disposing of Nuclear and Toxic Wastes

Commentor No. 189: Healthy Environment Alliance of Utah
Jason Groenewold (continued)

As we've read over portions of the DEIS, it seems that there is very little reason why the Utah Industrial Depot should be of any real consideration to the DNSC for use as a storage site for its stockpile of mercury. Therefore, HEAL Utah asks that you take either the no-action alternative, which involves maintaining the current stockpile at its current location, or selecting one of the four installations where the material is currently located as the primary storage site. AN-1

Here are some specific concerns as they relate to the DEIS:

Site Location & Security

1. You have no offices in Utah and it is a distant location from your current operations. Therefore, this will raise greater logistical challenges for ensuring proper monitoring and management of the stockpile. SB-4
2. You already have installations under your control where this material is stored and personnel are accustomed to handling it. That is not the case in Utah, which is one of the factors that you must consider according to the notice in the federal register. SB-4
3. There is the proper security in place to ensure the stockpile is not sabotaged in some manner. Each of the four installations in New Haven, Somerville, Warren, and the DOE site have armed security guards with barbed wire fencing surrounding the compound. The Utah Industrial Park could only offer a security alarm system and an occasional security inspection. This is not enough to ensure proper protection of the entire stockpile of mercury. This is also a factor that you must consider according to the notice in the federal register with respect to access, control and security of the site. SB-1
4. In the federal register notice, it mentioned that the interior of the building would have to maintain the mercury stockpile at a temperature of 70 degrees Fahrenheit or less. In our review, it was not apparent if the DNSC considered whether the Utah Industrial Park could meet that requirement. Temperatures in Tooele, UT often exceed 100 degrees as we are in a desert environment. Energy requirements would be significant to maintain the proper temperature, and if there were a failure in the cooling system (if one exists), that material could easily exceed 70 degrees Fahrenheit. SB-2
5. It was noted in the federal register that the DOE Y-12 facility was already built for the storage of mercury. The Utah Industrial Depot was not. AE-1
6. It was stated in Chapter 2 of the DEIS that the Utah Industrial Depot was selected because it is not near a major airport. This is incorrect. The Salt Lake International Airport is quite close to Tooele and could be reached in minutes by air. If this is one of the factors that determined selection, then the UID should be rejected on those grounds. RA-1

Travel and Shipments:

1. The distance for shipping the mercury to Utah is much further, and thus, a greater risk, than selecting one of the four installations where the mercury is currently stored.
2. It would take more than twice the number of truck shipments if Utah or NV were selected than a place like Somerville. The same is true for rail shipments. RT-1
3. The risk of a transportation accident increases significantly as the distance increases between transportation sites.
4. Local emergency responders have stated that they are not sure if there has been the proper training of local emergency responders to deal with a mercury spill, and also if the ER-1

Commentor No. 189: Healthy Environment Alliance of Utah
Jason Groenewold (continued)

proper equipment is in place to deal with such an accident in the event that an accident occurs. ER-1 (cont'd.)

5. There is not adequate protection for the shipments as they are currently planned. Shipping this much toxic material in a van is inadequate protection to guard against a possible release of mercury into the environment should an accident occur. RT-1
6. Has an assessment of possible terrorist attack on the shipment been conducted? RA-2
7. What would be the cost of clean up if an accident occurred and who would be responsible both in terms of cost and physical work of the clean up? ER-1

Cost Comparison & Economic Factors

1. Not that cost alone is the driving factor in making these decisions, but under your cost estimate comparison section, it is easy to see that the Utah Industrial Depot is 3 times more expensive than they cheapest option of using New Haven. Not to mention the increased cost in travel that would be required to visit the site from your headquarters in Belvoir, VA, open an office here, and have someone monitor the materials full-time. How would you explain the selection of Utah to taxpayers or Congress if you were asked? CB-1
2. Utah is the most expensive option considered by the DNSC at $62.3 million.
3. The Utah Industrial Depot as a private installation is only beginning and its financial stability has not yet been demonstrated. How much increase in costs would there be if the DNSC had to relocate the stockpile if the Utah Industrial Depot one day has to file for bankruptcy or decides to change the nature of its operations that do not coincide with long-term storage of mercury. There is much more certainty that one of the current depots where the mercury is stockpiled will remain open in 40 years than the certainty of a private installation. PO-3
4. The DNSC also loses a valuable measure of control over the mercury stockpile by storing it at a private location than a government location. Given the toxicity of the material and the need to ensure its proper storage, it should remain in government control, on government property, inside a government facility rather than in private hands.

Environmental Contamination and Socioeconomic Factors

1. Utah has already more than its fair share of environmental contamination. We have been home to half the nation's stockpile of chemical weapons with two chemical weapons incinerators. We have been home to the largest toxic air polluter in the country (MagCorp) and the largest emitter of toxins to the environment (Kennecott) according to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. In addition, we have severe contamination from uranium mining throughout the state, and Utahns were downwind to open-air atomic testing during the 50's and 60's. Furthermore, we have suffered through the haphazard military testing of both chemical and biological warfare agents at the Dugway Proving Ground. Utah is also being targeted to accept much of the nation's nuclear waste. It would be an injustice if Utah were now selected to store the nation's mercury stockpile as well. OS-3
2. Utah's image as a dumping ground is increasing all the time and this proposal will only tarnish our image that much more. This makes it increasingly difficult to attract the kinds of industries and businesses to our state that will provide good, safe jobs to our community. SE-2

Commentor No. 189: Healthy Environment Alliance of Utah
Jason Groenewold (continued)

3. Utah cannot support another facility of this toxicity to monitor and care for. We are overburdened as it is, and the last thing our country should do is place its stockpile of mercury in a place where it will not be properly monitored. OS-3

Site Closure

1. We did not see a plan for closure of the site and what will happen after 40 years. If as was mentioned in the Federal Register notice that long-term storage signifies an intent to store the mercury for longer than 40-years, then what is your plan for moving the material and when would that occur? If this is not the final decision as to what to do with the mercury, then it seems even more appropriate that the material would be left at the sites where it currently is present. DD-1

HEAL Utah would ask that the Defense National Stockpile Center select either the no-action alternative or the option of using one of the current stockpile sites for consolidation. Our preference is the no action alternative as that would eliminate the risk of transportation and would reduce the overall risk to one site if something were to go wrong. Consolidating everything in one location would mean that the overall risk would increase in that location if the stockpile were negatively affected in some way. Those sites furthest from the stockpile should not be selected, especially since it would involve the greatest risk in transportation and the highest cost. Furthermore, if as you conclude there is only a low to moderate risk associated with storage and it is equal throughout those sites considered, then it only makes sense to chose the ones that are most cost effective, have the shortest transportation distances, and provide the best security. The Utah Industrial Depot is clearly not the preferred choice. AN-1

If you have any questions about our comments or would like to discuss them further, feel free to contact us at (801) 364-5110 or (801) 355-5055.

Sincerely,

Jason Groenewold
Director, FAIR

Commentor No. 190: Lori Reiter

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name LORI REITER

Address 19 S. Rhodes

Organization

City Niles State OH Zip 44446

Phone 330-544-0236

E-mail Address

COMMENTS:

I would hope our Government would never approve Mercury to be stored where children + families are, not to ~~consider~~ take in consideration of our well-being. I would be ashamed of our government if you did this

RN-1

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:

Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
***toll free:** (888) 306-6682*
***toll free fax:** (888) 306-8818*
***e-mail:** information@mercuryeis.com*
***website:** www.mercuryeis.com*

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 191: Anna Altobelli

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense National Stockpile Center

anna altobelli

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name ANNA ALTOBELLI

Address 220. Hazel AV.

Organization

City ~~Niles~~ NILES State Ohio Zip 44446

Phone

E-mail Address

COMMENTS:

DO NOT Bring MERCURY To warren Ohio

AC-1

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:

Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: (888) 306-6682
toll free fax: (888) 306-8818
e-mail: information@mercuryeis.com
website: www.mercuryeis.com

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 192: Kimberly Jones

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name Kimberly Jones

Address 412 Asbury Lane

Organization

City Niles State OH Zip 44446

Phone 330-544-8269

E-mail Address

COMMENTS:

I do not like the idea of anything that is potentially harmful to our community. (Warren, OH)

RN-1

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: *(888) 306-6682*
toll free fax: *(888) 306-8818*
e-mail: *information@mercuryeis.com*
website: *www.mercuryeis.com*

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 193: Violet Clea

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name Violet Clea

Address 412 Asbury Ln

Organization

City Miles State Oh Zip 44446

Phone

E-mail Address

COMMENTS:

no thanks we don't want Mercury stored in Warren Ohio.

AC-1

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: *(888) 306-6682*
toll free fax: *(888) 306-8818*
e-mail: *information@mercuryeis.com*
website: *www.mercuryeis.com*

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 194: Betty Mymo

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name Betty Mymo

Address 205 Hazel St.

Organization

City Niles State O- Zip 44446

Phone 652-7907

E-mail Address

COMMENTS:

I do not approve of storing Mercury in Warren Ohio. You can never be sure of leakage, which is very hazardous. I am concerned for my Granddaughters children!

AC-1

RA-2

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: *(888) 306-6682*
toll free fax: *(888) 306-8818*
e-mail: *information@mercuryeis.com*
website: *www.mercuryeis.com*

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 195: Carl Mymo

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name CARL MYMO

Address 205 HAZEL ST.

Organization

City NILES State OH Zip 44446

Phone 330-652-7907

E-mail Address

COMMENTS:

I DON'T WANT MERCURY BROUGHT INTO THIS AREA!! (Warren, Ohio)

AC-1

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:

Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: (888) 306-6682
toll free fax: (888) 306-8818
e-mail: information@mercuryeis.com
website: www.mercuryeis.com

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 196: Sam Shobel

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name Sam Shobel

Address 632 Clay St

Organization

City Niles State Ohio Zip 44446

Phone

E-mail Address

COMMENTS:

Mercury is dangerous for the environment. EC-1 RE-1

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: (888) 306-6682
toll free fax: (888) 306-8818
e-mail: information@mercuryeis.com
website: www.mercuryeis.com

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 197: Dorothy C. Telshaw

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name DOROTHY C TELSHAW

Address 737 WASHINGTON AVE

Organization —

City Niles State Ohio Zip 44446

Phone 330-544-1309

E-mail Address N/A

COMMENTS:

I don't think "Mercury" should be dumped anywhere that anyone could be exposed. Especially children.

Dorothy C Telshaw

RN-1

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:

Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: *(888) 306-6682*
toll free fax: *(888) 306-8818*
e-mail: *information@mercuryeis.com*
website: *www.mercuryeis.com*

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 198: Christine Murray

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name Christine Murray

Address 4266 Bitter Root Dr

Organization

City Westerville State OH Zip 43081

Phone 614-523-4164

E-mail Address

COMMENTS:

My mother informed me of a possible plan to hold all of the nations Mercury in Warren Ohio. I do not feel this is a good idea. It doesn't seem to be a good idea to have such a substance in a community with people in close proximity. I feel a

AC-1

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: *(888) 306-6682*
toll free fax: *(888) 306-8818*
e-mail: *information@mercuryeis.com*
website: *www.mercuryeis.com*

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 198: Christine Murray (continued)

desert or a more isolated area would pose less of a danger, and be more responsible.

Thank you for your time.

Chris Murray

7/1/03

AC-1 (cont'd.)

Commentor No. 199: James Kowacich

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name James Kowacich

Address 229 McDonald Ave

Organization

City McDonald State Oh Zip 44437

Phone unlisted

E-mail Address

COMMENTS:

No Burning in Ohio from other states

AC-1

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: *(888) 306-6682*
toll free fax: *(888) 306-8818*
e-mail: *information@mercuryeis.com*
website: *www.mercuryeis.com*

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 200: City of New Haven
Honorable Terry E. McDonald

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
CITY OF NEW HAVEN
P.O. Box 570
815 Lincoln Highway East
New Haven, Indiana 46774
(260) 748-7070 (260) 748-7075 Fax
www.newhavenin.org

July 15, 2003

Mr. Cornel Holder, Administrator
Department of National Stockpile Center
8725 John F. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

RE: Consolidation of Mercury Issue

Dear Mr. Holder:

Please find enclosed additional petitions which were just received by our office. These petitions should be included with the packet that was forwarded to you earlier this week by Federal Express. As you can see from the voluminous amount of signatures submitted to you, the message is clear that citizens from New Haven and residents throughout Allen County are strongly opposed to the consolidation of mercury in this area. Concerned residents from this area collected a total of 800 signatures, which includes all petitions, and other written correspondence. AC-1 SE-2

Once again, I cannot emphasize enough how much harm this would do to our local economic development efforts by bringing the mercury to our area and further request the Defense National Stockpile Center to remove New Haven, Indiana from consideration as the consolidation site for the national stockpile of mercury.

Thank you for your time and serious consideration in this most important matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (260) 748-7070.

Respectfully,

Terry E. McDonald

Terry E. McDonald
Mayor
City of New Haven

cc: File
holder.wpd

"Equal Opportunity Employer"

Commentor No. 201: Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection Honorable Arleen O'Donnell

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
ONE WINTER STREET, BOSTON, MA 02108 617-292-5500

MITT ROMNEY
Governor

KERRY HEALEY
Lieutenant Governor

ELLEN ROY HERZFELDER
Secretary

ROBERT W. GOLLEDGE, Jr.
Commissioner

July 17, 2003

Attention: Project Manager
Mercury Management EIS
DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Dear Project Manager:

This submission presents comments from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts regarding the Defense National Stockpile Center's (DNSC) Draft Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), announced in the *Federal Register* on April 11, 2003 (68 FR 17787).

Overall, we would like to note that DNSC has completed an excellent draft document. Massachusetts strongly supports the conclusion reached in the EIS favoring the continued safe storage of the stockpile, as opposed to its sale. AP-1

Through the New England Governors and Eastern Canadian Premiers Mercury Action Plan, Massachusetts and the New England States as a group have, for many years, advocated for the continued safe storage of the strategic mercury stockpile in order to prevent its sale and ultimate release to the environment. Because international controls on mercury use and disposal are inadequate in many parts of the world, we believe that sales from the stockpile would ultimately increase unnecessary uses and releases of mercury, exacerbating local exposures to this toxin as well as atmospheric deposition globally, which would adversely affect our wildlife and citizens. AS-1

Because of the complex and changing nature of the international mercury market, any depressive impact of sales of these excess stocks (5000 lbs.) on virgin mining is very uncertain and likely to be

This information is available in alternate format. Call Aprel McCabe, ADA Coordinator at 1-617-556-1171. TDD Service - 1-800-298-2207.

DEP on the World Wide Web: http://www.mass.gov/dep
Printed on Recycled Paper

Commentor No. 201: Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection Honorable Arleen O'Donnell (continued)

minimal. Thus, the main argument in favor of sales is questionable at best. These uncertainties are attributable to: 1) production subsidizes supporting primary production, which have been and continue to be in effect in some countries; 2) decreased demand in many industries and new and ongoing initiatives that are likely to accelerate this trend; 3) increasing recovery and recycling of mercury due to voluntary and regulatory efforts in North America, Europe, and Asia, which are generally not supply-price sensitive (i.e. are driven by pollution prevention/control factors not the economic value of the mercury recovered); and, 4) sales of other private stockpiles of mercury (i.e. from the chloralkali industry) which were not adequately accounted for in the analysis. All of these factors make predictions of market responses to sales from the US Strategic stockpile, based on theoretical free-market models, highly uncertain and of limited usefulness.

AS-1 (cont'd.)

What is more certain is that sales from the stockpile would result in the ultimate use and release of a large amount of mercury into the environment and global food-chain, which is now safely sequestered from the biosphere. A logical inconsistency imbedded in the discussion of the sales option should also be noted. It is unclear how, if sales are in fact to be carried out in a way that would "not result in undue disruption of the mercury market" as currently required, such sales would then be able to effectively drive any substantive reduction in mining. On the other hand if the market is disrupted (i.e. prices are significantly decreased by such sales), this would clearly encourage expanded use, including unnecessary and poorly controlled applications that would result in releases and impacts to local populations and the global environment. In this situation, recovery and recycling efforts for price sensitive uses, such as in small-scale gold mining, would also be discouraged.

Thus we disagree with the Draft EIS statement that the three options considered would all have negligible impacts and that differences between them would not be sufficient in themselves to support selection of one option over another. In fact, we believe that the sales option would be much more likely to have significant adverse environmental impacts and thus is clearly less desirable. The discussions of potential adverse impacts associated with the sales option (detailed in Sections 4.4 and 4.5 of the Draft EIS) should be expanded to better acknowledge the potential for such impacts.

AG-1

Because of these issues, the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection strongly opposes the sales option and recommends that the EIS more clearly acknowledge the potential for adverse impacts associated with this alternative.

AS-1

Either of the two storage options presented, retaining existing storage locations or consolidating storage in a single location, is preferable to sales. MA does, however, want to emphasize that such storage must be implemented in a manner that assures long-term safety and is adequately financed by, and the responsibility of, the federal government.

AP-1

SB-1
CB-3

MA also would like to note and encourage your consideration of four mercury stewardship documents recently completed by the Environmental Conference of States Quicksilver Caucus (ECOS-QSC), which have been forwarded under a separate submission from ECOS. In particular the ECOS-QSC documents "Analysis of Mercury Market Policy Options" and "Review of Mercury Commodity Markets" provide considerable information supporting our conclusion that the sales option is environmentally less preferable.

Commentor No. 201: Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection Honorable Arleen O'Donnell (continued)

In conclusion, we would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on this draft EIS. We look forward to continuing to work with you as the Department of Defense decision is implemented.

Sincerely yours,

Arleen O'Donnell
Deputy Commissioner

Commentor No. 202: Mary Endicott

July 16, 2003

Project Manager
Mercury Management EIS
DNSC-Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Re: Mercury Storage Site

Gentlemen:

I am writing to you to let you know that Tooele, Utah is the contaminate storage site of the world; the dumping ground of poisons. Our people are already dying of cancer related illnesses in droves; miscarriages; and stillbirths. There are already many businesses leaking poison gasses into the air here and the danger of planes from nearby airports and air force bases crashing into contaminate storage facilities. I am sure that you can find another part of the country – a cheaper part of the country in which to store your mercury. Do not bring it to Tooele. Please leave us alone to die in peace. RN-2 RA-1 AC-1

Sincerely,

Mary Endicott
40 Columbia Drive
Tooele, UT 84074

Commentor No. 203: Karen Ashiolas

Comment FORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name Karen Ashiolas

Address 733 Washington Ave.

Organization

City Niles State OH Zip 44446

Phone 330 544-8150

E-mail Address Kari Sue1 @ AOL.com

COMMENTS:

I wouldn't be happy to see the Nation's mercury stockpiled in Warren, OHIO. AC-1

This is a heavily populated area and the risk of mercury vapors leaking could pose a hazard to our soil and environment. RA-2

Anything is possible. There are other areas that are of favorable conditions. AC-1

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:

Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: (888) 306-6682
toll free fax: (888) 306-8818
e-mail: information@mercuryeis.com
website: www.mercuryeis.com

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 204: New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Stephen B. Hammond and Jeffrey J. Sama

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Division of Environmental Permits, 4th Floor
625 Broadway, Albany, New York 12233-1750
Phone: (518) 402-9182 • FAX: (518) 402-9168
Website: www.dec.state.ny.us

Erin M. Crotty
Commissioner

July 18, 2003

Attention: Project Manager
Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement
DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Dear Project Manager,

The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (Department), would like to submit the following comments regarding the Draft Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), announced in the *Federal Register* on April 11, 2003 (68 FR 17787). The following comments are compiled from the individual comments received from members of the Department's Mercury Task Force.

Consolidated Storage
Of the three alternatives presented for management of the national elemental mercury inventory, we believe the consolidated storage of the mercury presents the least apparent risk. **AC-1**

Mercury Sale Opposed
We also feel that the sale of the stored mercury, for any reason, presents the greatest risks to the environment. We strongly recommend that sale of the mercury not be adopted as a solution in any form. **AS-1**

Proximity to Great Lakes Watershed
When considering retaining existing storage locations, geography must be taken into consideration. Two existing storage facilities, Warren Depot and New Haven Depot, as well as the proposed site, PEZ Lake Development, are in the near-Lake watershed of the Great Lakes, which hold about 20% of the world's freshwater. In a brief reading of the EIS, it was not apparent that any potential risk to the Great Lakes associated with the catastrophic failure of the mercury storage had been addressed. **WR-1**

Commentor No. 204: New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Stephen B. Hammond and Jeffrey J. Sama (continued)

Community Support/Benefit

Development around existing storage sites and any future site should also be a critical factor in deciding whether or not to consolidate or to relocate. Garnering support from the local community should be key in determining the final storage site. The new community should recognize and understand the risk posed by the storage and it may be necessary to compensate them for the increased risk to their community. DM-2 PO-1 SE-2

Safety

We understand the potential that consolidating provides for improved technology, but we also recognize the disadvantages/risk, of the materials handling, transporting, and security issues that arise in the consolidation of the mercury to a new location. We feel consolidating among existing storage locations is a valid alternative to continuing to use all current sites in existence or in the consolidation of the mercury to an entirely new location. Ultimately, comprehensive safety and community willingness should dictate the final selection between retaining existing storage facilities and consolidating storage in one location. AC-1 PO-1 SE-2

Thank you for this opportunity to provide our comments.

Sincerely,

Stephen B. Hammond, P. E.
Director, Division of Solid & Hazardous Materials

Jeffrey J. Sama
Director, Division of Environmental Permits
Chair, Mercury Task Force

cc:
Carl Johnson
Jack McKeon
Sandi Allen
Michael Flynn
James Honan
Peter Jones
Dennis Lucia
Barbara Nuffer

Commentor No. 205: Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
Graham E. Mitchell

OhioEPA
State of Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
Southwest District

401 East Fifth Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2911

TELE: (937) 285-6357
FAX: (937) 285-6249

July 17, 2003

Attention: Project Manager
MM EIS, DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

To whom it may concern:

Listed below are the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency's comments on the Draft EIS for mercury management.

General Comments

1. The alternative proposing the sale and release of mercury should be discouraged. There is a trend in many states and USEPA to discourage the use of mercury in many products. Mercury released as a byproduct or accidentally released into the environment is a significant environmental and health concern, especially in regards to its toxicity, persistence, and bioaccumulation. The Federal government should not increase the amount of mercury in circulation, but assist the States in reducing its availability for unnecessary use in products. **AS-1**

2. There are many states, Ohio included, that are working to educate their residents and industries on the dangers of mercury and encourage industrial sectors and populations to find mercury alternatives, use best management practices in dealing with mercury waste streams and retire mercury devices as appropriate. Releasing the federal reserves mercury stockpile to the open market would be counter productive and counter intuitive to this ongoing process.

3. If the decision is made to consolidate the mercury stockpile at one location, DLA should work with the state and local emergency response agencies along the routes to plan for the safe transportation of this material by either truck or rail. **RT-1**

Printed on Recycled Paper
Ohio EPA is an Equal Opportunity Employer

Bob Taft, Governor
Jennette Bradley, Lt. Governor
Christopher Jones, Director

Commentor No. 205: Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
Graham E. Mitchell (continued)

Specific Comments

1. 4.2.1.5., 4.2.2.5, 4.2.3.5, etc - Worth considering for human health impacts from the facilities is determining if any of the workers qualify as "women of childbearing age" and if they have had children during their employment at the facility, and finally if the children have been impacted in any way. Women of childbearing age and young children are the most susceptible population to mercury poisoning and therefore could be examined for toxicity effects. **RN-3**

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Graham E. Mitchell
Chief, Office of Federal Facility Oversight

GEM/sdj

Commentor No. 206: Richard Lady (Oak Ridge, Tennessee Public Meeting)

please bring it to me after you have spoken.

Written materials will be formally accepted into the record as exhibits to this meetings, in addition to your oral comments, and both are weighed equally by DNSC.

So with that out of the way we can start with our speakers. I have four people who have signed up at this point. And our first speaker this evening will be Richard Lady; I hope I am pronouncing that correctly.

And he would be followed by Joe Jovenith; is that correct? Am I close? Is he here? No? He is here but has stepped out? Yeah. Well, if he is here he will speak. If he isn't, Susan Gawarecki will speak. Please, Mr. Lady.

RICHARD LADY: Okay. My name is Richard Lady, L-A-D-Y, 2091 (Beth) (phonetically) Lane, Andersonville, Tennessee. Thank you for the great environmental impact statement. Personally, I think you ought to consider the consolidation and a sales effort. AG-2

BARRY LAWSON: That's it. Okay. Great. Okay. Thank you. Is Mr. Jovenith -- He is not here. Okay. Susan Gawarecki, please? And Barbara Walton is the other individual who has not

Commentor No. 207: Susan Gawarecki (Oak Ridge, Tennessee Public Meeting)

returned?

SUSAN GAWARECKI: My name is Susan Gawarecki. My address is 114 Pathfinder Lane, Andersonville, Tennessee, 37705. And these are my personal comments; they do not necessarily reflect those of my employer.

I think that you should consider the alternative to sell the mercury, possibly from a consolidated location; it seems that that has the greatest value to the taxpayer because, not only will there be some return on the material, but the storage costs would be ultimately diminished and finally eliminated: that's one positive result.

The second has to do with the environmental impact. Whether or not you sell the mercury, mercury will continue to be used. And any mercury that is sold will, in some part, offset mercury which is mined. And it's actually the mining and refining of mercury that has the greatest negative impact on the environment.

So this would actually be a benefit, since that process has already taken place with this mercury, and it would effectively displace, in the market, mined mercury.

I know that the preferred alternative is

AG-2
AS-1

Commentor No. 207: Susan Gawarecki (Oak Ridge, Tennessee Public Meeting) (continued)

currently to consolidate it in one location, but even if it takes 30 or 40 years to sell all of the mercury, if you didn't sell it, you would still have all of the mercury in that one location at the end of that time period.

And so I would urge that you choose to sell it either from a consolidated location or maybe multiple consolidated locations.

BARRY LAWSON: Great. Thank you very much. Ms. Walton?

BARBARA WALTON: The other person is not here?

BARRY LAWSON: I don't believe so.

BARBARA WALTON: I am Barbara Walton. I live at 85 North Claymore Lane in Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830. I serve as a member of the Citizens' Advisory Panel of the Local Oversite Committee. I am speaking as an individual this evening.

I would like to commend the Defense Stockpile Logistics Agency for their good work in preparing the environmental impact statement and for inviting the public comment.

I support the preferred alternative consolidation. And I would like to offer also some

AG-2
AS-1
(cont'd.)

Commentor No. 208: Barbara Walton (Oak Ridge, Tennessee Public Meeting)

currently to consolidate it in one location, but even if it takes 30 or 40 years to sell all of the mercury, if you didn't sell it, you would still have all of the mercury in that one location at the end of that time period.

And so I would urge that you choose to sell it either from a consolidated location or maybe multiple consolidated locations.

BARRY LAWSON: Great. Thank you very much. Ms. Walton?

BARBARA WALTON: The other person is not here?

BARRY LAWSON: I don't believe so.

BARBARA WALTON: I am Barbara Walton. I live at 85 North Claymore Lane in Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830. I serve as a member of the Citizens' Advisory Panel of the Local Oversite Committee. I am speaking as an individual this evening.

I would like to commend the Defense Stockpile Logistics Agency for their good work in preparing the environmental impact statement and for inviting the public comment.

I support the preferred alternative consolidation. And I would like to offer also some AC-1

Commentor No. 208: Barbara Walton (Oak Ridge, Tennessee Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 8

1 comments on the various site locations, since you
2 do intend to try to narrow that down before the
3 ROD.
4 I have the summary with me, but I did
5 look in some areas in the larger document, but I am
6 looking at the summary of cumulative impacts and
7 risks.
8 And, on the basis of only minor and
9 negligible risks, I would say that there are three
10 alternatives that are worthy of further
11 consideration, which are basically the
12 New Haven Depot, the Warren Depot and the
13 Hawthorne Army Depot.
14 All of the others have some moderate
15 impacts. Now, I also looked at the cost aspects of
16 this. And, of those sites, I note that both
17 Hawthorne -- Hawthorne is about three times more
18 expensive than the other two; and the other two are
19 both cheaper than the no-action alternative, so I
20 would like -- and of course that, as a taxpayer,
21 the two cheapest alternatives, if everything else
22 is equal, I would, you know, prefer.
23 But I also think that the feeling of the
24 majority of the people at the location should be
25 taken into account. And I did note that one of

AC-1 (cont'd.)

AC-1

CB-1

PP-1
PO-1

Esquire Deposition Services

D.C - 1-800-441-3376
MD - 1-800-539-6398

Commentor No. 208: Barbara Walton (Oak Ridge, Tennessee Public Meeting) (continued)

Page 9

PO-1
PP-1
(cont'd.)

those two sites made the newspapers nationwide with their opposition. I thank you.

BARRY LAWSON: Thank you very much. Do we know if Mr. Jovenith is here? All right. He left. Okay. Fine. Is there anybody else here who would like to speak? Comments? Okay.

If not, then it is my discretion to call a recess, which I will in just a minute or so. But before I do, let me explain how we will operate this.

We will be here for formal comments until at least 8:30. And so if any of you, or anyone else who arrives, would like to speak, we will reopen the hearing and take testimony at that time.

In the meantime, you are certainly welcome to stay around in case somebody else shows up or if you just want to shmuse a little bit and talk to some of the folks here about the mercury management.

If you do choose to stay I will certainly announce, if and when there is somebody who would like to make a statement.

If you choose not to stay and you are leaving, I just want to thank you very for taking your time this evening to learn more about it and

Esquire Deposition Services

D.C - 1-800-441-3376
MD - 1-800-539-6398

Commentor No. 209: Loris A. Sheets

2151 EAST PINE CANYON ROAD
LINCOLN, UTAH 84074
435-882-3188
FAX: 435-882-3188

August 16, 2003

Mercury Management IS
DNSC-E Defense National
Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, Va. 22060-6223

Attention: Project Manager:

I am writing this letter to let you know the feelings of myself and many other members of our community whom I have spoken to concerning your desire to store Mercury within the city limits of Tooele, Utah. I am going to inform you why I don't want any more contamination brought into Tooele County. AC-1

I live in Pine Canyon, also known as Lincoln, Utah. Pine Canyon is classified as a hazardous waste site. The community is located approximately 2.5 miles from the center of Tooele. The International Smelting and Refining site is located at the mouth of Pine Canyon. A copper smelter operated here from 1910 until 1946, and a lead smelter was operational from 1912 to 1972. A small-scale cleanup project conducted by Atlantic Richfield in the 1980s failed to eliminate the metals that were poisoning us. I have hiked the hills and valleys in the 1,200 acre site and believe the current attempt by the EPA Superfund to clean up the site is not acceptable. Hazardous contaminates are still visible on the ground. After a recent wildfire in the nearby community of Stockton, Utah, the Bureau of Land Management found more than they bargained for in the ashes. There were unacceptable levels of lead and some high levels of arsenic. Extensive efforts had supposedly been completed in the Stockton area to eliminate the hazardous waste. Because of the lead levels, the BLM will now close all travel on the public land to protect the health of the area residents.

Many residents of Pine Canyon and Tooele have respiratory infections and other chronic health conditions that they never had prior to living here. I came in contact with many residents of the valley, both longtime and recent, while working at a grocery store in Tooele. They asked me many questions about the general health of our local population. Both old and new residents complained of poor health, high taxes, horrible traffic problems, and if it was true about all the bad things located in Tooele County. Many are now trying to sell their homes and are moving elsewhere. My husband and I can attest to having severe respiratory problems, as can countless other residents. Health problems now being experienced include: acute and chronic bronchitis, pneumonia, severe sinus headaches and infections (requiring life-threatening surgeries near the brain and occipital nerves that required computer-guided surgeries). Among the most insidious and mysterious health disorders are--Trigeminal Neuralgia and Peripheral Neuropathy (caused by overexposure to certain chemicals--especially arsenic, mercury, lead, and the organophosphate found in many insecticides). Avoiding toxic chemicals can help prevent neuropathy and pneumonoconioses. Toxicologists have determined that about six decades of smelting operations have polluted the soil and possible underground water with lead, arsenic and cadmium, all dangerous if consumed in sufficient quantities.

1

Commentor No. 209: Loris A. Sheets (continued)

The city of Grantsville, just a few miles west of Tooele, has a high incident of cancer deaths. Many residents believe their cancers could be the result of their water supply being contaminated by chemicals used to clean vehicle parts for a government rebuilding program at Tooele Army Depot. They believe the chemicals were dumped on the ground and eventually reached the underground water supply to Grantsville. Residents also believe that the detonation of bombs and surplus weapons at Tooele Army Depot over the years have not only broken windows and cracked walls, but has polluted the air with dangerous particles of contaminated materials.

While EPA and state scientists say there is no evidence so far that people have been affected by the metals and contaminents from the smelters and mines, they add that health samples have been limited. We have had to euphemise horses and other farm animals because of serious respiratory and other health problems caused by hazardous agents in the air they breathed and in the grains and hay they may have eaten. There is a lot of illness in this community that we should not be experiencing. The industries that residents once thought were saving our communities by providing jobs are now killing us. Tooele Valley was once a safe, beautiful place to live. There is a large block letter "T" on a mountain representing our local high school and city of Tooele. It has turned into a local joke--it now stands for "Toxic." The vegetation is finally returning to the mountain landscapes after being brown and barren for years because of the smoke and contaminants from the smelters in our county. They are gone now. This is a good thing.

A large influx of people has moved into Tooele County. They moved here to get away from the gangs and criminals in the larger cities in Utah. They wanted a rural atmosphere and less traffic congestion. The present reality is that they face high taxes, horrible traffic problems, poor health, and few job opportunities. They are good people and we are sorry they now must face the cold hard facts that Tooele County is a dirty, radioactive, dangerous, polluted, deadly place to raise a family. Our population has tripled in the last ten years and we have added only one new stop light. We can no longer turn left at many intersections onto main street to do business and reach our necessary destinations. We put our lives on the line every time we step into our vehicles. I had three grandsons in a serious automobile accident on Tooele's main street two weeks ago. My grandson wasn't cited for any error in his driving. Quite the contrary--a hit-and-run driver left the scene of the accident, but there were plenty of witnesses who saw what had happened. There was no street light at this intersection and someone just got tired of waiting and took several lives into his hands when he vaulted onto the street in a race for space.

Despite all the news about the possible dangers of the Army's Chemical Weapons Incinerator just south of Tooele, the greater danger may be traveling down Tooele's Main Street. Hazardous chemicals are transported down Main Street all the time, according to the county's hazardous response manager. For example, there is a business that trucks 3,000 gallons of liquid sodium cyanide--three times a week--down Main Street. It is both toxic and deadly. What if it spills? What if it hits another vehicle? Also exploding down our small main street are sodium hydroxide and sulfuric acid, both heading for Tooele Chemical Activity, just south of Tooele which still has to destroy approximately 25-40 percent of the nation's stockpile of aging chemical weapons. Located just northwest of Tooele is U.S. Magnesium (a top 50 polluter in the nation). We need to get these chemicals OUT OF OUR COUNTY if they don't meet pollution standards NOW. A study about this sorry traffic situation was done and the projected solution for the traffic dangers, jams and gridlocks would, at very minimum, be 10-15 years in the future. Let us pray. A new Wal-Mart superstore will be built next year in Grantsville, increasing our traffic by 1600 trucks per day. Can you imagine the problems that will cause? This same freeway also leads to 15 or more hazardous sites and businesses in Western Tooele County, not including the Air Force Test Range where an inert AGM 129 cruise missile recently missed its target and hit near Ibapah, which is near the Goshute Indian Reservation where some residents are currently trying to land the deal to obtain rights to store spent nuclear rods in Tooele County. These utilities/companies promise millions of dollars that never materialize. We don't produce this waste in Utah and we shouldn't have to store it.

2

Commentor No. 209: Loris A. Sheets (continued)

We, as a county and as a state, have done more than our fair share to help our country as a designated dumping ground. We want to quit. We have met our quota and more. We have received enough hazardous material. We recently received a shipment from our Idaho neighbors to the north. We didn't order radioactive dirt from Idaho to Tooele Country. What? Fifteen-hundred tons of radioactive contaminated soil were sent by Idaho Governor Phil Batt? What? Tooele County and state officials say the radioactive soil is safe if handled properly? Then why don't they keep it up there? Should we have it dumped in the yards of Tooele County and Utah State officials? Idaho forged an agreement with the Federal Government last October which would send all of that state's nuclear waste somewhere else for disposal. What? Twenty-one railcars of radioactive waste from Idaho have already been shipped to Envirocare's Clive disposal facility in Tooele County, Utah? We are told there is nothing to worry about? Officials at Clive say, "These materials are really something you wouldn't want in your back yard!" What? Some Tooele County officials are welcoming not only nuclear, but also hazardous waste. They have no problem with the waste coming here? What? "I don't have a problem with what's coming in because we are set up to receive it!" said another commissioner? I believe these commissioners were both voted--OUT during our last election! The fact is, "the facility at Clive will be accepting waste for at least 40 more years. Once the Clive site is full, the ground will be capped with seven feet of clay, a fence erected around the perimeter, and a granite slab will be placed on top. The slab will be engraved with a warning for future generations of the dangerous material underneath." The trouble is that we have so many sites in Tooele County that the whole county will have to be paved over and signs erected. What a wonderful legacy we will leave our posterity.

"For many years, the Army conducted open air tests of biological and chemical agents at Dugway Proving Ground. They sprayed deadly nerve agent VX out of airplanes, exposed soldiers to biological, as well as chemical agents and conducted simulated nuclear meltdowns in the middle of the desert. All of this was done in secret and the public didn't find out about it until years later. Even today, thousands of acres of BLM and private land outside of the proving ground remain contaminated with unexploded conventional and chemical weapons." This information was reported in our local newspaper, The Transcript Bulletin.

Remember the sheep incident in Skull Valley that never happened? And the number of whole family units that have died from cancer in that area? They died. We all have heard the stories. We have too much sickness in our county. We have too much traffic and poor management of highways and regulatory signs and lights. We have such a disgusting reputation as the national dump. Don't add to our problems. AC-1

WE DO NOT WANT ANY MORE SICKNESS AND DEATH; NOR DO WE WANT TO ADD TO OUR COUNTY'S ALREADY BAD REPUTATION OF BEING THE NATION'S DUMPING GROUND. WE HAVE LITERALLY HAD OUR FILL. WE DO NOT WANT MERCURY IN TOOELE CITY LIMITS NOR ANY OTHER PLACE IN TOOELE COUNTY.

Thank you,

Loris A Sheets

LORIS A. SHEETS
PINE CANYON PRESS

3

Commentor No. 210: Cari Allen

Log Furniture, Inc.
Toll Free: 877-427-4268 Office 435-843-4488 Fax: 435-843-4491
1930 West E Avenue Bldg. 621 Utah Industrial Depot Tooele, Utah 84074
P.O. Box 1226 Tooele, Utah 84074

September 2nd 2003

Defense National Stockpile Center
Attention: DNSC-E
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
Phone: 888-306-6682
Fax: 888-306-8818

To whom it may Concern,

My name is Cari Allen, my company is Log Furniture, Inc. Located in Bldg. 621 in the Utah Industrial Depot, in Tooele, Utah., which happens to be located less than 500 feet from the Utah Industrial Depot's proposed long-term storage site for the national stockpile of Mercury (almost 5,000 tons)

I have gone to several public meetings in Tooele County concerning this Mercury storage and can tell you without question the information disseminated by the Utah Industrial Depot concerning the facilities, the security and their capabilities are grossly exaggerated. The potential warehouse storage sites are World War II vintage Bldgs. Which are deficient in structure and temperature control, security is non existent and even the longevity of Depot Associates to enter into a long term contract is very questionable. SB-1

It would seem to me that of all the land in the United States, a facility could be chosen that was closer to the three existing storage sites and not within the city limits of Tooele , less than 500 feet from civilian employees, less than ½ mile from a church, less than 1 mile from an elementary school, and less than 2 miles from the hospital and not to mention residences less than ¼ of a mile away. AC-1 AE-1

The information about the potential storage site first came to me via the news media in mid July of this year. As a tenant with a long term lease and an option to buy my bldg. number 621. I feel that the Utah Industrial Depot owed me a more direct and personal disclosure of their plan to store 5,000 tons of what the federal Environmental Protection Agency deems to be a hazardous material a material that they won't sell, can't destroy, vaporizes at room temperature and has been outlawed by at least one state (Minnesota) with pending legislation in at least 5 others. PP-6

The Utah Industrial Depot's own information letter indicates the storage facility would only add a possible 2 jobs yet the city of Tooele in exchange for these 2 jobs must SE-1

Commentor No. 210: Cari Allen (continued)

increase it policing and fire capabilities plus revamp its hazmat department. This seems like a very poor economic exchange not only for Tooele City and Tooele County but the State of Utah, particularly when the estimated cost of cleaning up a Mercury spill is between $700.00 and $750.00 dollars a gram. SE-1 (cont'd.)

As we all have been painfully aware after 9/11 an incident is not just delegated to just an accident and considering the proximity of the Salt Lake City International Airport moving 5,000 tons of a hazardous material to the Utah Industrial Depot in Tooele City, seems to not only be extremely dangerous material but fool hardy and short sighted. RA-1

Thank you, very much for your time and consideration

Sincerely,

Cari Allen

Cari Allen, CEO Log Furniture, Inc.

Commentor No. 211: United States Department of the Interior
Willie R. Taylor

United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Washington, D.C. 20240

In Reply Refer To:
ER 03/348

Attention: Project Manager
MM EIS, DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060-6223

Dear Sir or Madam:

The U. S. Department of the Interior has reviewed the April 2003, Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Mercury Management prepared by the Defense National Stockpile Center (DNSC). The Draft EIS was prepared to help DNSC determine how to manage its elemental mercury inventory over the long-term, as the mercury is no longer needed for national defense. Mercury is currently stockpiled in seven locations by the DNSC, and has accumulated and been maintained since the mid-1940's as part of the National Defense Stockpile Program, so that it would be available for defense or other critical uses during a national emergency. About 4,890 tons of mercury are in the stockpile and are stored in 128,662 steel flasks. The flasks are then stored in 30-gallon steel drums for additional protection. The primary goal for management of the mercury is the protection of human health and the environment. The Draft EIS evaluated the three primary alternatives:

1. No Action. This involves continued storage at three currently active DNSC storage locations: New Haven Depot, Indiana; Somerville Depot, New Jersey; and Warren Depot, Ohio. Continued storage at Y-12 at the Department of Energy National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, Tennessee is also included.

2. Consolidated Storage. This involves storage at any one of the three DNSC sites listed above, plus the following potential sites: Hawthorne Army Depot, Nevada; PEZ Lake Development, New York; and Utah Industrial Depot, Utah. This is the agency preferred alternative.

3. Sales: This includes two options: 1) selling mercury at the proposed maximum allowable market rate to producers over a period of years; and 2) the sale of the entire inventory to a mercury mining company with an agreement to reduce mercury mining to compensate for the release of DNSC mercury. Both alternatives assume overseas sales, most likely in Europe or Asia, since mercury is no longer mined in the United States.

Commentor No. 211: United States Department of the Interior
Willie R. Taylor (continued)

2

In principle, the Department would agree with the consolidated storage alternative which supports DNSC's long-term closure plans for several depots and makes the stored mercury available for future beneficial uses. However, the DNSC currently does not have a preference for one of the consolidated storage sites. Selection of one of these sites would be made in the Record of Decision. AC-2

The Department believes the least preferable site for consolidated long-term storage of mercury would be Hawthorne, Nevada. Hawthorne is located on the southern end of Walker Lake, one of only a few unique terminal desert lakes in the world. Walker Lake provides habitat to the threatened Lahontan cutthroat trout and provides important habitat for several species of fish-eating birds, including common loons, during spring and fall migration. Walker Lake is ecologically and environmentally stressed as the result of a continuing decline in lake levels, increased levels of total dissolved solids and salinity, elevated pH, increased water temperatures, and other contaminants. Lahontan cutthroat trout are maintained in the lake through stocking and must first be acclimated to waters of high total dissolved solids in order to survive. Tui chub in the lake failed to spawn in 2002, due to declining water quality conditions. Elevated mercury concentrations of 0.9 *ppm* were recently found in the tissue of fish collected from Walker Lake; this level is a potential threat to fish and fish-eating birds, e.g., common loons. The storage of mercury at the Hawthorne Army Depot would present a risk of contamination of Walker Lake due to a spill, and therefore, would not be the Department's preferred alternative. AC-2

One of the known truck transportation routes to Hawthorne Army Depot is U.S. Highway 95, which skirts the western shore of Walker Lake. A transportation accident involving a mercury shipment along this stretch of road could potentially provide an additional source of mercury to the lake. If Hawthorne would be selected for consolidated mercury storage, the Department suggests that State Route 362 be used as the mercury truck transportation route to the site. We suggest also that this recommendation be made a part of the Record of Decision.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Mercury Management Draft EIS. I hope that our comments are useful. If you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact Everett Wilson, Chief or Dr. Geoffrey A. Ekechukwu, of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Division of Environmental Quality at (703) 358-2148. You may also contact Ken Havran in the Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance at (202) 208-7116.

Sincerely,

Willie R. Taylor
Director, Office of Environmental Policy
and Compliance

Commentor No. 212: David B. Smith

HOWDY

I AM INTERESTED ABOUT THE MOVEMENT OF MERCURY HERE TO TOOELE UTAH. THE ONLY COMMENT I CAN MAKE RIGHT NOW WITHOUT KNOWING THE FULL PROPOSAL IS. I CAN ONLY FEEL GOOD ABOUT MERCURY COMING TO UTAH IF THERE A WAY THAT CAN BE USED IN FUTURE SO WONT ALWAS BE IN UTAH. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW MORE SO COULD YOU PLEASE SEND ME MORE INFORMATION

AC-2
DD-1

THANKS
DAVID B. SMITH

DAVID B. SMITH
1259 E. SOUTH TEMPLE #6
SALT LAKE CITY UTAH
84102

Commentor No. 213: Jean Tomlin

CommentFORM

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
Defense National Stockpile Center

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Defense National Stockpile Center is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of helping to determine the best long-term management approach for our excess mercury. We appreciate your involvement throughout the EIS process. Please use this form to provide written comments on the Draft MM EIS. Continue on the back of the form or attach extra sheets, as necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name Jean Tomlin
Address Box 778 Will Compute? move -
Organization Help Contig prop owner
City Tooele State UT Zip 84074
Phone 435-882-0420
E-mail Address jtomlin@qwest.net

COMMENTS:

46 stockpiles on 1,700 acres now? + you? I own property on 2 of the 4 corners of the UP RR crossing

Still? Our ERG assessment? Strategic 20, no, no worth
South Area - ? Dangerous No Long
Who is involved to respond ERG sale
Still made? ER-2
UD - storage + future?
We have our share -
Your are sent why not your other depts.
Why not your 3 sites - AE-1
Bus plans change? No Hg mat.
Why here not So ap. plan?
Generate rev for com taxes - ?

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road
Suite 3229
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223
toll free: *(888) 306-6682*
toll free fax: *(888) 306-8818*
e-mail: *information@mercuryeis.com*
website: *www.mercuryeis.com*

Disclosure is voluntary. The information on this form is part of the public administrative record for the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act and may be reproduced and distributed as part of that record.

Commentor No. 214: Kelly Jones

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Kelly Jones and I am a resident of the Overlake subdivision. I would like Tooele to attract family owned businesses. People are referring to our area as "toxic Tooele". We are selling our house and prospective buyers are worried about Tooele. I am disappointed that consolidated mercury storage is considered. I hope the citizen's voice will be heard on this issue. My address is 1945 N. 210 West, Tooele, UT

SE-2

AC-1

Commentor No. 215: Sarah Bookmiller

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Sarah Bookmiller (spelling?) and I am totally against mercury being transported or stored in Utah.

AC-1

Commentor No. 216: Veronica Medina

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Veronica Medina, my number is 801-463-1864. I live in Salt Lake City and do not want mercury brought here.

AC-1

Commentor No. 217: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

If you bring mercury it will make people not want to move here and will empty many homes in the area.

SE-2

Commentor No. 218: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Why do they have to come here? There is already too much pollution here and I don't think we should have it here.

AC-1

Commentor No. 219: Pamela Timmons

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Pamela Timmons and I don't want your crap here.

AC-1

Commentor No. 220: Lindsey

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Lindsey. Please get it out of Utah.

AC-1

Commentor No. 221: Mark Myers

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Mark Myers, I am a life long resident of Utah and don't think it's a good idea to have mercury in our area. Why not put it in Washington DC? **AC-1**

Commentor No. 222: Clint Steward

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Clint Steward (spelling?); we don't need any more waste here. Get it out of Utah and find another state for it. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 223: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Take your (expletive deleted) mercury and shove it up your (expletive deleted) you sick (expletive deleted). You are a bunch of stinking; sick (expletive deleted) to think you are going to stick us with that junk, you sorry ass (expletive deleted). **AC-1**

Commentor No. 224: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I am against mercury being moved here given how much damage it can cause. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 225: Kathy Funk

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I'm upset that Tooele is being considered. Please move it to a less populated area. My name is Kathy Funk. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 226: Pamela Timmons

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Pamela Timmons. It would be a detriment to the community to have it stored here. I vote "no" to having it moved to our community. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 227: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I live near Tooele and don't like this idea at all. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 228: Frankie Harris

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Frankie Harris and I am a Tooele city taxpayer. I am definitely opposed to having the mercury stored here. Please reconsider. How would you feel if it was stored in your own backyard? I live at 830 Country Club, Tooele UT 84074. My number is 801-556-4430. Thank you. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 229: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

The citizens of Salt Lake City think it's a bad idea to have it here. We don't need any more mercury or garbage here. Send it somewhere else. For the safety of Salt Lake City, the west winds blow through here and it could kill us all. We need to let the governor know about this. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 230: Amanda Hanson

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Amanda Hanson (spelling?), I live in Tooele and I don't want it here. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 231: Trudy Bancroft

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Trudy Bancroft, 972-3274 they should keep it where it is. My address is 2360 S. 1360 W., West Valley UT 84119 **AN-1**

Commentor No. 232: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I object to the storing of mercury in Tooele. Please find another state to store it in. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 233: Cherie Groll

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Cherie Groll and I am against mercury being stored in Utah. My number is 801-944-1986. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 234: Mr. Marshall

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My comment is not to store the mercury due to terrorist reasons. Close the Tooele depot. My name is Mr. Marshall. **AC-1 OS-3**

Commentor No. 235: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

We vote "no" for the mercury in Tooele. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 236: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I am calling to say I don't agree to storage here. I live downwind and don't want it here in a populated area. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 237: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I object to storage of mercury in Tooele. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 238: Merle Jones

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Utah doesn't need the world's waste. Leave your garbage where it is. My name is Merle Jones and my number is 801-423-7799. **AN-1**

Commentor No. 239: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I vote against the mercury coming here. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 240: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I don't want mercury in the state. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 241: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

There is no need for mercury in Tooele. I am totally against mercury coming here. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 242: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I disagree with storage here at the depot. Enough is enough! We need to take more pride in our state. The depot is too close to the city to have any more hazardous materials stored there. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 243: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I want to know what type of drums is the material stored in? What is the drum life? Is it stored in a controlled environment? What type of floor is it stored on? Is it alarmed? What is the depth of the water table? Is the state to be paid? Is there an emergency response plan? You should have my phone number in your records. **SB-1 WR-3 ER-1**

Commentor No. 244: Amanda Hanson

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Amanda Hanson, and I dispute the delivery of mercury to this area. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 245: Adam Elder

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Adam Elder and I live in Tooele. I don't think that it is right to have it stored here. The incinerator at Tooele is not safe. We need to find a better way to store it and get rid of it. A terrorist up in the hills could hit one of the buildings at the depot with an RPG and cause a lot of damage. **AC-1 OS-3**

Commentor No. 246: Lisa McLeary

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Lisa McLeary (spelling?) and I believe that storage of the mercury in Tooele is not necessary. I am against storage. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 247: Jessica Heathcock

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Jessica Heathcock (spelling?) and I am a Tooele resident. It is not helpful to the county to have mercury stored here. The health risks are too great and being downwind from the depot will reduce property values. **AC-1 SE-2**

Commentor No. 248: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Please don't bring the mercury here. Thank you. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 249: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I live in the Tooele area and I do not want it here. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 250: Lisa McLeary

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

My name is Lisa McLeary (spelling?) and on behalf of my children we protest the storage of mercury. Consider the health and well being of our citizens. Please vote it down. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 251: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Please don't bring the mercury to our town. We don't want it here. Take to another place that is less populated. Thank you. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 252: Lisa McLeary

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Yes, I just wanted to comment on the storage of the mercury in Utah. I don't think it's necessary. I would highly vote against the storage of the mercury in Utah. My name is Lisa McLeary (spelling?) and I am against the storage of mercury in Utah. **AC-1**

Thank you.

Commentor No. 253: Diane Hanley

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Hi, my name is Diane Hanley and I live in Otto which is just down the street from this mercury plant, this potential mercury cite and I would like to say that I do not want this in our city. I am raising children and I think it would be ridiculous to put that kind of … we already have to deal with all kinds of other issues out here. It would be ridiculous to put that here as well. So I'm telling you we say no. **AC-1**

Thank you.

Commentor No. 254: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

This is a concerned citizen here. I live here in Tooele County. I think it's absolutely absurd to dump mercury inside the city limits. I have a family that lives here and that's not healthy. I know a lot of people that are upset about it. I don't think it's a good idea to dump the city or dump that inside the city limits and I hope that they take the concerns and the people that live here in Tooele. I hope they consider the individuals that live here when they take that into consideration. I appreciate it and I hope you guys think about it and think about us here in Tooele County. Thank you. **AC-1** **WM-1**

Commentor No. 255: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Yes, I'd like to vote against having the mercury in Utah. We have way too much stuff here anyway. We're going to start glowing. Thank you. Bye. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 256: Shirley Keel

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Yes, this is Shirley Keel, Shirley Keel from Tooele, Utah and I'm just calling to tell you I do not want that mercury here in Tooele. We have a lot of sickness in this town. Mercury is not that stable. It can vaporize and we've got enough storage here as it is. We do not need anymore. **AC-1**

I believe people that make these hazardous waste things should keep them in their own place where they make them. They don't need to just send it all to us out here. We've got little kids sick everywhere in this town. We don't need anymore hazardous waste. So have them keep the mercury where it is. My telephone number is 435-882-0123.
Thank you. **AN-1** **WM-1**

Commentor No. 257: Jeff Bosworth

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Hi, my name is Jeff Bosworth. I am a hardworking, taxpaying citizen of the United States and I oppose the mercury storage in Tooele. I oppose the mercury storage in Tooele. Thank you. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 258: Jacob Crovert

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Yeah, my name is Jake. I'm 28 years old. Lived here in Salt Lake for quite some time. I was born and raised in California for a while and I reside here in Salt Lake City, Utah. And I'm very appalled at the thought of them using Utah as the dumping grounds for its nuclear waste and mercury and other chemicals that are top-notch death destruction. You know. When there is an issue it's a major issue. It's not like, "Oh God Johnny spilled it on his hands and we just had to scrub him and he was ok" You know? This stuff gets spilled; we've got a disaster. Very wrong thing to do, very wrong thing to do. Why don't the people put it in their own towns--the people that are manufacturing it. Why don't they put it in their own towns? You know why? Cause they wouldn't want it either. None of them would. They're trying to offer it to a town that has nothing to do with it. They might be interested in some money. So that's what they're doing this. **AC-1** **PN-2**

I appreciate you letting me vent. My name is Jacob Crovert. Once again I'm 28 years old. 347-0692, that's my phone number. Thank you.

Commentor No. 259: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Hi, I just recently moved to the Tooele county and I never thought it was right that nuclear waste was stored out in the vicinity of the army depot and so I am against mercury being out there cause they're trying to get rid of all that and we don't need to add anymore waste to the depot. **AC-1** **WM-1**

Commentor No. 260: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I do not want mercury shipped into Utah. My number here is area code 801-370-9108 if you did not understand my comment. Thank you, and once again I do not want mercury shipped into Utah. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 261: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I am against this storing of mercury in Tooele. Too many things have escaped from there. There have been too many careless things going on. I live in Salt Lake City and have smelled things in the middle of the night and then found out on the news at noon that about half hour before I smelled it something had escaped at Tooele. So I'm don't think it's at all safe the way people are doing thing around here. Thank you. **AC-1** **RN-2**

Commentor No. 262: Zachary Christianson

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Yeah, my name is Zachary Christianson and I was just calling to say that I do not want the mercury stored here in Utah, in Tooele. We already have enough of the rest of the countries waste dump here. And I don't think we should have to take this one as well. Thank you. **AC-1 WM-1**

Commentor No. 263: Sarah

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Hi, my name is Sarah and I live in Tooele County and I don't want mercury in my area. So I'd appreciate if you take this into consideration for my family and me. Thank you very much. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 264: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

No, I don't want you to send mercury in any part of Utah. We've got enough problems with birth defects over in Tooele and we prefer for you not to send it there and that's it. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 265: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I am against the storage of mercury in Tooele, Utah and I want it to be kept where it is and don't bring it here and wherever it is you're putting it in two places and spreading that and contaminating both places. Keep it where it's at. Thank you. **AC-1 AN-1**

Commentor No. 266: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I don't think mercury should be stored in Tooele County anywhere in the county and especially not in Tooele city limits. I don't think that's a safe product to be having. I think that we're we don't want to be known as the dumping ground of the world for toxic stuff that could kill people really easy. I don't think that's good environmental policy to be doing this sort of thing and I think enough-is-enough and the Federal Government is out of their mind to bring it here. Stay out of Tooele County when it comes to putting toxic waste into our water and where ever else it can seep into the atmosphere. We don't want to breath it and we don't want to die like the sheep did in 1968. Thank you very much. **AC-1 WM-1**

Commentor No. 267: Robert Johnson

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Yes, this Robert Johnson in Tooele, Utah. We would like you to keep your mercury to yourself and keep it out of our city. Thank you. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 268: Steven Winters

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

This Steven Winters from Salt Lake City, address 2605 Commonwealth Avenue.
I would like you to put me down, as being against the storage of mercury at the Tooele Army Depot and my number is area code 801-466-2354. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 269: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Yes, I at definitely am against any mercury stored at Utah cause we have enough storage of everything kind of known chemical that's dangerous and lethal to man. We don't need anymore. Thank you. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 270: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

I am strongly against mercury being stored in Tooele. I am the representative of human beings involve my relations and the ancestors of those who came before me and my grandchildren, and to my grandchildren's, grandchildren…I say no to this. Find a better way so that it is not stored in our back yard. It is not to be here to destroy my mother's breasts. Please find another solution. Lets work together on this and I say no. No more. **AC-1**

Commentor No. 271: Raina Barron

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

Hi, I just wanted to comment on the mercury situation. I really appreciate that you have this line available to do that. I just wanted to be another voice to say that I do strongly oppose this. I think that Utah, Tooele especially, has already has its fair share of highly deadly chemicals that are released into the air every day, that we all feel in our headaches and various other ailments that are much worse than that. I would appreciate some sort of maybe like a follow up statement. Something telling me where this is going, you know, what's happened if that's possible. Any sort of pamphlet I could get to find out, you know, when this is going to go through, if it is going to go through and if there's going to be any other periods available for public comments on that. I would really appreciate it. My name is Raina Barron. My address is 3230 South 600 East, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84107. Thank a lot.

AC-1

PP-1
PP-5

Commentor No. 272: Anonymous

From the MM EIS toll-free voice mail–

We're requesting you not have any mercury out there in Tooele and we have many, many more of us that are going to be calling just to let you know there so many of us that do not want this for our children. We think it's a bad idea and I once lived in Tooele a few years ago. I don't feel it's safe out there. I feel the leaking is a problem. Plastic, I also worked in plastic all my life and it's not good protection for containing any of this, and bags and what not. That's not going to hold it in. Please do not have the mercury come in. Please do not. For your own good and for ours. Thank you.

AC-1
SB-1
AC-1

Commentor No. 273: Anonymous

From the MM EIS Web site–

I am very against the fact that there is mercury waste to be stored in Tooele. the facility is located in city limits, which I consider very unsafe for the town.

AC-1
WM-1

Commentor No. 274: Harry Shinton

From the MM EIS Web site–

Dear Sirs;
After reading the complete EIS, that you have on your web site, I wish to express my personal position. My family and myself are VERY OPPOSED to the transportation and storage of mercury in our city. I submit this position after extensive reading and attending two public meetings that discussed your consolidation issue. My family has expressed concern to our neighbors and local reprehensive. Hopefully, Tooele will not be selected for storage of the supply of mercury.
Thank you,
Harry Shinton
196 West 400 North
Tooele, Utah 84074

AC-1

Commentor No. 275: Margaret Bish

From the MM EIS Web site–

I IMPLORE YOU TO NOT STORE MERCURY AT THE TOOELE ARMY DEPOT AND CHEMICAL STORAGE IN UTAH. WE HAVE ENOUGH TOXIC MATERIAL THAT IS ALREADY IN STORAGE HERE - WE DO NOT NEED MORE!CONSIDER THE HEALTH OF ALL UTAH CITIZENS AND DO NOT ALLOW THE STORAGE OF MERCURY IN THIS STATE! THANK YOU - MARGARET BISH

AC-1
RN-2

Commentor No. 276: Scott Stratton

From the MM EIS Web site–

ON TOOELE, UTAH Tooele and the surrounding areas of growing population, not to mention next door the states largest population center. Utah already is a dumping ground for biological, nerve agents and military experiments. PS: don't dump your trash in my backyard! THINKS one voter

AC-1
WM-1

Commentor No. 277: Eileen Greene

From the MM EIS Web site–

I am very concerned about the idea of centralized storage. This is something that should be pursued only with extreme caution. The decision on where to place the Mercury should not be taken lightly in any way.

AC-1

One of my big concerns is the issue of transportation... particularly whether there would be the need for an extensive cross-country transportation scheme. If this were to happen, all of the concerns we currently having regarding Mercury storage and the risks to the nearby communities would be magnified to include the many additional communities that would be exposed along the transportation routes. I think it should be a top priority to avoid spreading these toxins into new areas.

RT-1

For this reason, I think it would be extremely wise to pick a location that would not necessitate the transportation of Mercury across the entire United States. In other words... if it is determined that centralized storage is the most optimal solution, I do not think that it is logical or fair to be targeting areas on the West Coast, as basically *all* of this material is being produced by facilities on the East Coast. The transportation scheme that would be needed to accomplish this could place many millions of *additional* people, living along the transportation route, at risk.

It also strikes me that the facilities that actually have *experience* in dealing with the storage of this material would more likely to be capable of avoiding accidents and other problems.

AC-1
AE-1

Thank you very much for your consideration of these ideas.

Sincerely,

Eileen Greene
3580 Honeycomb Rd.
Salt Lake City, UT 84121
visualizations3@sisna.com

Commentor No. 278: Anonymous

From the MM EIS Web site–

I am very against the fact that there is mercury waste to be stored in toole. the facility is located in city limits which i consider very unsafe for the town.

AC-1
WM-1

Commentor No. 279: Ray Brown

From the MM EIS Web site–

I do not have a problem with mercury being stored in Tooele Army Depot in Utah. I live in S.L.C. and the stuff has to be stored somewhere. AC-1

Commentor No. 280: Wayne D. Jones

From the MM EIS Web site–

I would like this comment to be considered as part of the public record concerning the environmental impact study for Tooele, Utah. For a significant part of its history, Tooele County has suffered from the stigma associated with toxic waste storage, disposal, and incineration. The U.S. military has stored the nation's largest stockpile of deadly chemical weapons and agents in Tooele County for many decades. In recent years, the military has been incinerating these obsolete chemical weapons in a high tech population in Tooele County. Although few Tooele County residents live near the incinerator, the stigma and controversy surrounding the incineration process has been forever associated with Tooele County. Many people living elsewhere in the State of Utah consider Tooele County to be an undesirable place to live, even though they have never come here. As a result, Tooele County has become a haven for those seeking inexpensive housing. Most of these people commute from the Salt Lake Valley. This places a strain on local infrastructure and budgets. There is a glut of abandoned homes in Tooele County because many homes are not worth what is owned on the mortgages. When people cannot pay, they simply walk away. In addition to the chemical weapons incinerator, Tooele County is known for radioactive waste disposal. Private entities operate hazardous waste dumps in Tooele County's west desert. Large amounts of low grade radioactive material and other hazardous materials are buried there. Tooele County has also become synonymous with the Skull Valley Tribe of the Goshute Indians' bid to make a site on their reservation a temporary storage facility for spent fuel rods from the nation's nuclear reactors. At least the above- mentioned operations and proposed operations are not located near Tooele County's population centers. Most are located far from cities and towns. If the nation's surplus supply of mercury is brought to Tooele Army Depot as proposed, however, it will be stored within the city limits of Tooele City, Tooele County's most populous city. The Tooele Valley, where Tooele City is located, is the home to the vast majority of Tooele County's residents. At least in the past Tooele City has been able to claim that all of the toxic waste operations in the County occurred far from its borders. With the proposed storage of the surplus mercury, this will no longer be the case. The mercury storage proposal will generate significant coverage in the press. The proposal will have the unfortunate effect of reinforcing Tooele's reputation throughout Utah and much of the West as the Nation's toxic waste dump. From what has been said, it does not appear that the mercury storage operation will create a significant amount of jobs or otherwise generate the economic activity that Tooele City so badly needs. It will only attract other undesirable activities to the depot. Tooele County's unemployment rate is already approximately double the state average. People living here are less likely than others in the state to graduate from high school or earn college degrees. Teen pregnancy, alcohol and drug abuse, and other social problems plague Tooele City and County. The mercury storage proposal will only exacerbate these problems if it comes to pass by further damaging Tooele City's reputation as a desirable place to live and work. Those of us who live and work here understand Tooele City's virtues. From a geographical standpoint, it is

SE-1
SE-2

SE-1
SE-2

Commentor No. 280: Wayne D. Jones (continued)

a beautiful place located in the foothills of a majestic mountain range and overlooking the Great Salt Lake. This place has great potential from a socio-economic standpoint. Mercury storage would be a significant impediment to this potential. For socio-economic reasons, please consider locating the mercury storage facility somewhere other than Tooele City.

Commentor No. 281: Brett and Heather Telford

From the MM EIS Web site–

WE DON'T WANT IT HERE IN TOOELE. LEAVE IT WHERE IT IS OR DUMP IT SOMEWHERE ELSE. THE POPULATION HAS GROWN ALOT OUT HERE. WE ARE SICK AND TIRED OF PEOPLE TRYING TO DUMP THEIR WASTE HERE IN TOOELE!!!!! **AC-1** **WM-1**

Commentor No. 282: Ruth G. Persson

From the MM EIS Web site–

They are making Utah a dumping ground for nuclear waste. Mercury is as dangerous. It's all in the name of money. We don't need it and definitely don't want it. They think we are stupid. I've got news that those who make the waste should take care of it in their own state. **AC-1** **WM-1**

Commentor No. 283: Pamela A. Mallet

From the MM EIS Web site–

I say NO. No to storing Mercury in the Tooele Utah area. I live here and have had enough of government waste dumped in my back yard. I say no for my children's sake and for everyone else who consider their prosperity important. Do you have any idea the of the stigma Tooele carries....and to put more waste here..absurd! It is hard enough to make a living as a real estate professional with the current status of the area. I do need to support my family but more importantly, I want my children to be somewhat safe i.e., keeping more waste out of Tooele. I am sure that I speak for many. **AC-1** **SE-2** **WM-1** **AC-1**

Commentor No. 284: Anonymous

From the MM EIS Web site–

I would prefer that you keep all hazardous material away from Utah. It's not in the States best interest to contaminate our roadways with hazardous transportation nor the immediate environment. I know this wont do any good because the politics and capitalism for profit will prevail, but at least if you take the time to read this you will know there is at least one individual that doesn't approve of your idea!!!!!!! **AC-1**

Commentor No. 285: John C. Haymond

From the MM EIS Web site–

Please do not bring in mercury for storage. I beg you. I am so against this. **AC-1**

Sincerely,
John C Haymond

Commentor No. 286: Janna Harrell

From the MM EIS Web site–

I am very concerned about the potential storage of mercury merely 45 miles from my home. I do not want it moved here! It is not safe to store such dangerous materials so near to a major metropolitan area. The depot in Tooele has had repeated leaks and safety problems. We do not need or want more chemicals in our backyard! I know they need to go somewhere, but please find a location further from a large city. It is simply too dangerous to house the mercury so near to so many people. Please do not locate the storage facility so close to my home. Thank you for considering my concerns. Janna Harrell **AC-1**

Commentor No. 287: Tom Chapman

From the MM EIS Web site–

Absolutely NOT ! Utah has become the dumping grounds for every state in the union under the guise that it is completely safe. It is not and we are not so stupid as to believe that. If the mercury is so safe, store it next to Washington D.C. **AC-1** **AE-1**

Commentor No. 288: Cameron Spencer

From the MM EIS Web site–

I am adamantly opposed to the storing of mercury in the Utah Industrial Depot in Tooele, UT. As a Tooele resident, I am fully aware of the hazardous materials that are already housed in our county. I feel that we have more than our share of these materials and its time for another state to house its 'fair share' of these materials. Why is it that somewhere more remote can not be selected to house these materials? More importantly, why can these materials not stay where they are? To clean up 1 gram of mercury costs $750. Why risk moving the stockpile(s) of mercury? If something happens mid-transport, the cost to taxpayers and the environmental impact would be catastrophic. Contrary to popular belief, Tooele is not the nations 'dump', this area was inhabited by people long before the Industrial Depot existed. The US government needs to consider this and avoid storing mercury here at all costs. Sincerely, Cameron Spencer 5922 Bayshore Dr Stansbury Park, UT 84074 **AC-1** **AN-1** **RT-1**

Commentor No. 289: Molly

From the MM EIS Web site–

I saw on the news that they are considering storing large quantities of mercury in Utah. As a resident, I'd prefer my state not be used as America's dumping grounds for hazardous chemicals. We have more than our share stored here currently. If mercury is sensitive to heat and becomes a vapor when it gets too hot, doesn't it seem logical to not store it in the desert? I'm sure there's a back up plan for when the power goes out to prevent it from getting too hot, but even the best laid plans can go bad. What about when the earthquake that is likely to hit the Wasatch front occurs? How confident are you on your back up plan? I personally think the risks far outweigh the benefit of adding a hand full of jobs. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

AC-1
SB-2
SB-2
RA-1

Commentor No. 290: Nicole Gonzales

From the MM EIS Web site–

I am writing in regards to storing the mercury within the city limits of Tooele City. I ask that you please reconsider Tooele as an option. The location that you are considering is to close to the people. I understand that, if heated, the mercury can let out deadly vapors - with that in mind I'll have you know that we recently had one of our hottest summers where temperatures got as high as 104, so just imagine if all those tanks of mercury are just sitting reaching a boiling point. I also think that if anything were to happen they would be so close that there wouldn't be a sufficient amount of time to give a reasonable warning. If you want to store it in this area, at least consider moving further west or south of Tooele. Thank you for taking the time to read this and I hope you carefully consider all options. Nicole Gonzales

AC-1
SB-2
AE-1

Commentor No. 291: Michael R. Johnson

From the MM EIS Web site–

I support the DNSC's decision to consolidate the nation's mercury stockpile in one location; it makes perfect sense. I cannot support, however, the selection of Utah Industrial Depot ("UID") as one of the potential sites, and believe that the UID site should be deleted from the final EIS. First, from a cost perspective, it simply makes no sense to consider UID. The cost of transporting mercury to the UID would be enormous compared to the other potential sites, and in particular Warren, Ohio. Second, while I believe that the storage of mercury is basically safe, the concern for me would be adequate security to guard against terrorist acts and other threats. UID is a private facility with little security. The mercury should be stored in a secure facility owned by the federal government, perhaps at an existing army base or other depot. Third, I believe that the draft EIS is flawed and must be amended. It does not adequately discuss the costs and expenses to be incurred by the federal, state and local governments to continually store and monitor the mercury in perpetuity. It also fails to account for the "perception" factor. What impact would storage of mercury at UID and other facilities have in terms of perception from the community at large? With respect to UID, would it detract other businesses from locating at the UID and would it keep people from moving to Tooele or the surrounding area? Finally, it seems almost impossible to do an

AC-1
CB-1
SB-1
AE-1
CB-3
SE-2

Commentor No. 291: Michael R. Johnson (continued)

adequate EIS without a selected site. The location that the mercury will be stored at should be one of the critical factors considered, and the DNSC should recommend not only one of the options, in this case consolidation, but it also should recommend a preferred site for the consolidation to occur. Thank you for consideration of these comments. AP-1

Michael R. Johnson, Esq.
SNELL & WILMER LLP
Gateway Tower West
15 West South Temple, Suite 1200
Salt Lake City, UT 84101
Phone: (801) 257-1903
Fax: (801) 257-1800
E-mail: mrjohnson@swlaw.com

Commentor No. 292: Brian Roberts

From the MM EIS Web site–

I just read your environmental impact statement. I think it is foolish to spend money storing something that is no longer needed and can be sold for $18 to 25 million. The answer is obvious. Sell the mercury. Even better, do some good with it. Since mercury is a poison, why not use it to clean up another poison? Sell the mercury and use the money to clean up the uranium tailings next to the Colorado River next to Moab, Utah. Those tailings resulted from making nukes for the cold war. The tailings are leaching into the river. A natural disaster causing the river to shift or tailings to go down stream would be a catastrophe since California relies on much of the water for agriculture and potable water. A company in Utah has proposed moving the tailings by pipe by mixing them with water in a slurry. It's a good idea. The state just needs money to do it. Use the money from the mercury (a poison) to clean up this other poison (uranium tailings). This also fits in well since the Governor of Utah, Mike Leavitt, is supposed to head the EPA. If you decide to store the mercury, have you considered its danger if a terrorist bombs it and turns it into vapor? I feel it is not worth the risk or expense to store it when it is not needed. I do not understand why there is even a question since the answer should be obvious. Brian Roberts.

AS-1

CB-2

RA-2

Commentor No. 293: Ohio Department of Natural Resources
Joe Mion

Ohio Department of Natural Resources

BOB TAFT, GOVERNOR SAMUEL W. SPECK, DIRECTOR

Division of Wildlife
Steven A. Gray, Chief
1840 Belcher Drive
Columbus, OH 43224-1300
Phone: (614) 265-6300

October 28, 2003

Dennis Lynch
Mercury Management EIS, DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

RE: Draft mercury management Environmental Impact Statement
Warren Deppot
Trumbull County, OH

Dear Mr. Lynch:

This letter is in response to your request for information on the presence of any state protected animal and plant species, both listed and proposed, and any other species of concern known to occur or potentially occur in the vicinity of the Warren Depot.

The project is in the historical range of the Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis),* a state and federally endangered species. If it is necessary to remove any trees to complete the project, it is recommended you first contact the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for guidance. It is also in the historical range of the Bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), a federally threatened and state endangered species. For current information on the presence of bald eagles in the area it is recommended you contact Mark Shieldcastle of the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Crane Creek Experiment Station at (419)898-0960.

EC-4

The project is also in the historical range of the Clubshell mussel (*Pleurobema clava*), a federally and state endangered species, the Eastern Massasauga (*Sistrurus catenatus*), a federal candidate species and state endangered species, the black bear (*Ursus americanus*), a state endangered species, the bobcat (*Felis rufus*), a state endangered species, the barn owl (*Tyto alba*), a state threatened species, the least bittern (*Ixobrychus exilis*), a state threatened species, the trumpeter swan (*Cygnus buccinator*), a state endangered species, and the yellow-bellied sapsucker (*Sphyrapicus varius*), a state endangered species.

The Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves maintains the Natural Heritage Database, the state's most comprehensive

DNR 0001

Commentor No. 293: Ohio Department of Natural Resources
Joe Mion (continued)

record of Ohio threatened and endangered species. They also have the records of state or federally listed plant species. If you have not already done so, it is recommended you contact the Division of Natural Areas and Preserves at (614) 265-6453.

The ODNR, Division of Wildlife is available to provide guidance on avoiding or minimizing impacts to any listed fauna and/or their habitat. If you should need further assistance, feel free to contact Becky Jenkins at (614) 265-6631.

Sincerely,

Joe Mion
Program Administrator

Commentor No. 294: New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Dorothy P. Guzzo

State of New Jersey
Department of Environmental Protection
Division of Parks & Forestry, Historic Preservation Office
PO Box 404, Trenton, NJ 08625
TEL: (609) 292-2023 FAX: (609) 984-0578
www.state.nj.us/dep/hpo

James E. McGreevey
Governor

Bradley M. Campbell
Commissioner

April 23, 2003
HPO D2003 - 147
Log # 03-1450-1

Attn: Dennis Lynch
Mercury Management EIS, DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060-6223

Dear Mr. Lynch:

As Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer for New Jersey, in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties, as published in the Federal Register 11 January 2001 (64 FR 77698 - 77739), I am providing **Consultation Comments** for the following project:

Somerville Borough, Somerset County
Somerville Depot (mercury storage site)
Draft Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement
US Department of Defense, Army

§ 800.4 Identification of Historic Properties

Review of the Historic Preservation Office's resources indicate that there are no properties listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places within the US Department of Defense, Somerville Depot. In addition, none of the proposed management alternatives outlined in the Draft EIS are anticipated to result in exterior alterations to existing buildings or new construction within the Somerville Depot. Therefore, I concur with your finding that there are no historic properties affected within the project's area of potential effects. Consequently, pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1), no further Section 106 consultation is required unless additional resources are discovered during project implementation pursuant to 36 CFR 800.13. CR-2

Additional Comments

We look forward to continuing consultation with you in the future. Should there be any further questions, please contact either of the following members of my staff: Daniel Saunders at (609) 633-2397 or Pilar LaValley at (609) 777-4473.

Sincerely,

Dorothy P. Guzzo
Deputy State Historic
Preservation Officer

DG/DS/pl

New Jersey is an Equal Opportunity Employer
Recycled Paper

Commentor No. 295: Indiana Department of Natural Resources
Jon C. Smith

DNR Indiana Department of Natural Resources

Frank O'Bannon, Governor
John Goss, Director

Division of Historic Preservation & Archaeology • 402 W. Washington Street, W274 • Indianapolis, IN 46204-2739
Phone 317-232-1646 • Fax 317-232-0693 • dhpa@dnr.state.in.us

May 9, 2003

Dennis Lynch
Mercury Management EIS, DNSC-E
Defense National Stockpile Center
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 3229
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060-6223

Federal Agency: U.S. Department of Defense

Re: Draft Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement (Reilly, 2003) for the consolidated storage of mercury

Dear Mr. Lynch:

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. § 470f) and 36 C.F.R. Part 800, the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer ("Indiana SHPO") has conducted an analysis of the materials dated April 2, 2003, and received by the Indiana SHPO on April 8, 2003, for the above indicated project in New Haven, Jefferson Township, Allen County, Indiana. CR-5

Thank you for providing our office an opportunity to comment on the environmental assessment. Based upon the information provided, we do not have any additional comments.

If you have any further questions, please call Karie A. Brudis of our office at (317) 232-1646.

Very truly yours,

Jon C. Smith
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

JCS:KAB:kab

An Equal Opportunity Employer
Printed on Recycled Paper

2.3 RESPONSES

This section presents DNSC's responses to the comments received. The responses are organized by issue category. The comment issue is summarized, followed by DNSC's response. References made to document sections and tables in DNSC's responses pertain to the Final MM EIS (Volume I) unless otherwise noted. Table 2–3 provides an index to the responses. This table presents the issue categories, indicates the page where the response is located, and identifies the comment documents to which they apply.

Table 2–3. Index of Responses by Issue Category

Code[a]	Issue Category	Page[b]	Applicable Comment Documents[c]
AC	**Alternative – Consolidated Storage**		
AC-1	General	2–318	1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 31, 33, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 53, 54, 55, 57, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69, 70, 72, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 84, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 117, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 128, 131, 137, 138, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 146, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 163, 164, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 176, 179, 180, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 191, 193, 194, 195, 198, 199, 200, 202, 203, 204, 208, 209, 210, 212, 214, 215, 216, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 239, 240, 241, 242, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291
AC-2	Hawthorne Army Depot	2–320	106, 211
AC-3	PEZ Lake Development	2–321	4, 5, 18, 19, 23, 24, 172
AE	**Alternative – Eliminated**		
AE-1	Candidate Sites	2–321	13, 102, 164, 170, 189, 210, 213, 277, 287, 290, 291
AE-2	Treatment and Disposal	2–322	7, 56, 83, 113
AG	**Alternative – General**		
AG-1	Comparison of Impacts	2–322	148, 168, 201
AG-2	Hybrid	2–323	148, 206, 207
AN	**Alternative – No Action**		
AN-1	General	2–323	1, 32, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 59, 74, 111, 149, 163, 185, 189, 231, 238, 256, 265, 288
AP	**Alternative – Preferred**		
AP-1	General	2–324	7, 25, 37, 167, 178, 201, 291
AP-2	Sales	2–325	147
AS	**Alternative – Sales**		
AS-1	General	2–325	53, 73, 75, 111, 121, 130, 134, 136, 170, 174, 175, 201, 204, 205, 207, 292
CB	**Cost/Benefit**		
CB-1	General	2–326	9, 36, 56, 113, 164, 175, 189, 208, 291
CB-2	Funding Other Programs	2–327	292
CB-3	Funding Mercury Management Activities	2–327	164, 201, 291

Table 2–3. Index of Responses by Issue Category (Continued)

Code[a]	Issue Category	Page[b]	Applicable Comment Documents[c]
CR	**Cultural Resources**		
CR-1	Warren Depot	2–327	26
CR-2	Somerville Depot	2–327	100, 294
CR-3	Hawthorne Army Depot	2–328	29
CR-4	Y–12 National Security Complex	2–328	28
CR-5	New Haven Depot	2–328	295
DM	**Decisions to be Made/Record of Decision**		
DM-1	General	2–328	32, 46, 70, 101, 139, 165, 167
DM-2	Population	2–329	56, 58, 64, 113, 117, 204
DM-3	Removal of Mercury	2–329	38, 76, 152, 154, 161, 183
DD	**Decontamination and Decommissioning**		
DD-1	General	2–329	56, 113, 189, 212
EC	**Ecological Resources**		
EC-1	Environmental Impacts	2–330	66, 175, 196
EC-2	New Haven Depot	2–330	85, 95
EC-3	Somerville Depot	2–330	68, 79
EC-4	Warren Depot	2–331	293
EO	**EIS Presentation and Organization**		
EO-1	General	2–331	146
ER	**Emergency Response**		
ER-1	General	2–331	7, 32, 71, 189, 243
ER-2	Utah Industrial Depot	2–332	59, 213
EP	**Environmental Regulations, Permits, and Consultations**		
EP-1	General	2–332	73, 106
EP-2	Walker River Agreement	2–332	87, 177
LU	**Land Use and Visual Resources**		
LU-1	General	2–333	100
LU-2	Utah Industrial Depot	2–333	2
NP	**NEPA Process/Adequacy**		
NP-1	General	2–333	2, 60, 130
NP-2	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	2–333	27
NP-3	Local Experts	2–334	171
NP-4	No Comment	2–334	22
NP-5	Schedule	2–334	171
OS	**Other Site Issues**		
OS-1	Community Acceptance	2–334	173
OS-2	Contamination	2–334	137, 138
OS-3	Out of Scope	2–335	41, 54, 76, 110, 131, 132, 170, 189, 234, 245
OS-4	Radioactive Materials	2–335	137
OS-5	Environmental Restoration	2–335	108, 137
PO	**Policy (DLA, DNSC, DOE, EPA)**		
PO-1	Approval	2–335	174, 204, 208
PO-2	Mercury	2–336	3, 146, 148
PO-3	Privatization	2–336	189
PP	**Public Participation**		
PP-1	General	2–336	2, 128, 131, 132, 146, 208, 271
PP-2	Comments	2–337	181
PP-3	Extension of Comment Period	2–337	150, 189
PP-4	New Haven Depot	2–337	46
PP-5	Phone Call	2–338	161, 271
PP-6	Notification	2–338	210

Table 2–3. Index of Responses by Issue Category (Continued)

Code[a]	Issue Category	Page[b]	Applicable Comment Documents[c]
PN	**Purpose, Need, and Timing**		
PN-1	Depot Closure	2–338	56, 65, 113, 118, 130, 175
PN-2	Other Mercury	2–338	3, 7, 14, 34, 56, 113, 116, 134, 136, 162, 258
PN-3	Out of Scope	2–339	7
PN-4	Schedule	2–339	165
RP	**Related Programs/Documents**		
RP-1	General	2–339	174
RE	**Risk – Ecological**		
RE-1	General	2–339	106, 196
RE-2	New Haven Depot	2–340	109
RA	**Risk – Human Health – Accidents**		
RA-1	General	2–340	1, 9, 31, 33, 54, 56, 70, 84, 96, 101, 103, 109, 110, 112, 113, 117, 123, 128, 133, 136, 138, 143, 168, 175, 182, 189, 202, 210, 289
RA-2	Terrorist	2–341	31, 58, 66, 169, 189, 194, 203, 292
RA-3	Tornado	2–341	9, 117, 131, 135
RN	**Risk – Human Health – Normal Operations**		
RN-1	General	2–342	32, 35, 36, 46, 76, 129, 131, 190, 192, 197
RN-2	Cumulative	2–342	202, 261, 275
RN-3	Sensitive Individuals	2–343	205
RT	**Risk – Transportation**		
RT-1	General	2–343	7, 15, 30, 31, 75, 104, 117, 143, 165, 189, 205, 277, 288
RT-2	Spent Nuclear Fuel	2–345	107
RT-3	Walker River Indian Reservation	2–344	177
SE	**Socioeconomics**		
SE-1	General	2–345	2, 7, 119, 130, 180, 210, 280
SE-2	Property Values and Development	2–345	1, 2, 11, 31, 32, 33, 42, 54, 56, 66, 108, 110, 113, 117, 122, 124, 130, 137, 138, 164, 175, 180, 182, 189, 200, 204, 214, 217, 247, 280, 283, 291
SB	**Storage Building Design and Operation**		
SB-1	General	2–345	6, 17, 31, 32, 33, 48, 71, 72, 114, 117, 118, 138, 163, 182, 189, 201, 210, 243, 272, 291
SB-2	Temperature	2–346	107, 189, 289, 290
SB-3	Leaks	2–346	7, 54, 110, 112, 114
SB-4	Logistics	2–347	189
WM	**Waste Management**		
WM-1	General	2–347	16, 59, 106, 254, 256, 259, 262, 266, 273, 276, 278, 281, 282, 283
WR	**Water Resources**		
WR-1	General	2–347	20, 58, 106, 126, 179, 204
WR-2	Approval	2–347	85
WR-3	Utah Industrial Depot	2–348	145, 243

[a] Issue category codes appear in the margin of the comment documents (Section 2.2) and serve to link the comments to the applicable DNSC responses (Section 2.3).

[b] Page numbers indicate the location of the summary responses in Section 2.3.

[c] Provides the comment document identification number of comments that received the same response.

Key: DLA, Defense Logistics Agency; DNSC, Defense National Stockpile Center; DOE, U.S. Department of Energy; EIS, Environmental Impact Statement; EPA, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; NEPA, National Environmental Policy Act.

AC-1. ALTERNATIVE – CONSOLIDATED STORAGE – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: More comments were received on consolidated storage than on any other issue. Many commentors were opposed to the Consolidated Storage Alternative. The most frequently cited reasons for opposition included concerns about:

- Human health risks from leaks, accidents, and terrorist acts
- Proximity of the storage locations to populated areas
- Adverse effects on property values and negative perceptions affecting economic growth in the surrounding communities
- Adverse effects on the environment

Some commentors were in favor of consolidated storage. The most frequently cited reasons for their position included:

- Benefit of removing the mercury from the existing storage locations
- Moving the mercury to a less populated area
- Ease of management at one location

Some commentors suggested that DNSC obtain approval of state and local governments and the community before a site is selected for consolidated mercury storage.

DNSC RESPONSE: As discussed in Section 2.3, DNSC's preferred alternative is consolidated storage at one location. Decisions on mercury management will be based on the environmental analyses presented in the EIS, including health and safety, security, and socioeconomics, and other factors such as cost, strategic considerations, and public input. DNSC will announce its decisions and the reasons for them in the Record of Decision (ROD), which will be published no earlier than 30 days after publication of the Final MM EIS Notice of Availability. The ROD may specify the Consolidated Storage Alternative (preferred alternative), No Action Alternative, Sales Alternative, or a combination of these alternatives (hybrid alternative). The mercury storage facility would be financed by the Federal Government, and the mercury would continue to be owned, and its conditions monitored, by the Federal Government.

Because mercury is a hazardous material, DNSC imposes strict controls to prevent exposure or release to the environment or to personnel working in the storage locations. The *Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Report for the Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement* (*Risk Assessment Report*) (DLA 2004) was prepared to support the MM EIS. The results of this risk assessment are included in the MM EIS. As described in Chapter 4 and summarized in Section 2.5 of the MM EIS, risks to the public from mercury released during facility accidents would be negligible to low at any of the candidate sites for all the alternatives considered. Mercury vapors that might escape from the storage facility after an accident would be diluted to low concentrations before reaching the public. This includes mercury that could be released during natural disasters such as earthquakes and tornadoes and human-initiated spills, leaks, and other accidents. Populations residing near the candidate sites are unlikely to face a major public health threat. This is because the risks are already negligible to low for an individual member of the public under the worst conditions that can reasonably be expected, and thus the risks for the general public would be even lower.

Mercury has been transported as a common industrial commodity for many years. Transportation of mercury would be in accordance with the U.S. Department of Transportation hazardous material shipping requirements for using commercial truck and rail routes. The *Risk Assessment Report* evaluates the

potential consequences of truck and rail transportation. Risk is a function of both frequency and consequence, and the more miles traveled, the greater the opportunity for an accident to occur. The greatest risk to the public would result from a truck transportation accident resulting in a mercury spill and fire. As described in Chapter 4 and summarized in Section 2.5 of the MM EIS, risk from this accident would be low for both acute (short term) and chronic (long term) exposure if the accident occurred while it was raining. Without rain, the chronic risk would be negligible. The risk of a traffic fatality occurring somewhere along the route would be low.

Ecological risks resulting from this postulated accident range from negligible to moderate, depending on the receptor organism and the weather. However, the probability that a fire would occur while it is raining and the limited area involved suggest that the ecological risks of transportation accidents are likely to be lower than estimated.

DNSC provides armed security, perimeter fencing, and closely controlled access at the current storage locations. DNSC also works with local authorities to ensure that even the most unlikely scenarios would be handled properly. DNSC has prepared a risk analysis of a deliberate aircraft crash and conducted vulnerability assessments at the current storage locations to ensure that the mercury remains safe and secure. These internal reports, which indicate that the mercury stockpile is not a likely target for terrorists, are not available to the public for security reasons. DNSC would require comparable levels of protection at any storage location.

DNSC has worked with the public throughout the EIS process to help them understand the potential risks presented by the mercury management alternatives so that opinions can be formulated based on facts and not perception. DNSC has safely stored mercury for more than 50 years and has taken additional precautions to ensure that it continues to be stored safely over the next 40 years by overpacking the mercury in steel drums and making modifications to the storage buildings. Sections 1.2.3 and 2.2.1 describe mercury storage at the existing locations. As summarized above, the analyses indicate that there is negligible-to-low risk to the public associated with consolidated mercury storage at any of the candidate sites.

As described in the Chapter 4 water resources subsections, plans would be in place should a leak or spill occur. The mercury storage sites would have approved Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plans and Installation Spill Contingency Plans to ensure that the appropriate response to a spill is made. The workforce at the mercury storage locations would be trained to respond to mercury spills. State and local emergency response teams would be aware of the mercury storage. Should there be a mercury spill, it would be cleaned up to applicable standards.

There would be no new construction and therefore no impacts on the environment from land-disturbing activities. As described in Chapter 4 and summarized in Section 2.5, negligible-to-minor environmental impacts would result from activities associated with the Consolidated Storage Alternative.

As described in Section 1.5, DNSC has supported a vigorous public outreach program. DNSC has hosted 12 public meetings nationwide, and provided information on the MM EIS in the form of newsletters, fact sheets, reports, exhibits, and a Web site. Email and toll-free telephone and fax numbers have been available for public queries and comments. Postcards were sent to households in the immediate vicinity of potential storage sites to inform them of public meetings and comment opportunities. DNSC has also provided briefings for state and local officials and others in communities potentially affected by mercury management activities, and will continue to inform communities affected by the mercury management alternative that is selected.

AC-2. ALTERNATIVE – CONSOLIDATED STORAGE – HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT

ISSUE SUMMARY: The Nevada Department of Administration is opposed to the consolidation and storage of mercury anywhere in Nevada because the state has contributed more than its fair share in meeting national defense, security, and waste disposal needs. The United States Department of Interior supports the Consolidated Storage Alternative, however, the least preferable candidate site would be the Hawthorne Army Depot because of concerns about potential impacts on Walker Lake.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC recognizes Nevada's contributions and concerns. DNSC has safely stored mercury for more than 50 years and has taken additional precautions to ensure that it continues to be stored safely over the next 40 years by overpacking the mercury in steel drums and making modifications to the storage buildings. As described in Section 2.2.1, mercury at the DNSC depots is stored in 76-lb (34-kg) capacity flasks sealed in airtight 30-gal (114-l) drums. The flasks are separated by dividers inside the drums and rest on an absorbent mat that doubles as cushioning material. Flasks are enclosed in plastic bags and sealed with wire ties. Drum lids have half-inch rubber gaskets, and a steel locking ring is bolted in place to seal the drum lid. The drums rest on catch trays on wooden pallets on sealed floors. As described in Section 4.2.1.5, the catch trays can contain the contents of several flasks. Should an emergency occur, the mercury storage sites would have approved Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plans and Installation Spill Contingency Plans to ensure that the appropriate response would be made.

As described in Section 3.6.6.1, Walker Lake is about 5 mi (8 km) from the closest potential mercury storage facility. There are no perennial streams in the Walker Lake Valley, where the Hawthorne Army Depot is located. The lack of water flow from the depot to Walker Lake would provide some protection of the lake in the unlikely event of a spill outside the mercury storage buildings. Mercury in soil can be cleaned up more readily than mercury in a stream or lake, and elemental mercury in dry soil is not transformed into more toxic forms. With the safeguards described in the previous paragraph, the likelihood of harm to Walker Lake would be very small.

A comprehensive risk assessment was performed to support the MM EIS. The results of this risk assessment are included in the MM EIS and are documented in the *Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Report for the Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement* (DLA 2004). As described in Section 4.3.4 and summarized in Section 2.5 of the MM EIS, ecological risks from normal operations at the Hawthorne Army Depot would be negligible. Section 4.3.5 states that in the unlikely event of a facility accident in which mercury is released by a fire, airborne transport could result in negligible-to-low ecological risks as a result of dry deposition of mercury. At the Hawthorne Army Depot, the buildings are constructed of reinforced concrete and are not combustible. Risks from wet deposition were predicted to range from negligible to moderate. The moderate ecological risks would occur if the accident with fire occurred during a rain event, which is unlikely in a dry climate.

Section 4.3.6 evaluates reasonable scenarios for truck and rail transportation accidents. The likelihood that a traffic accident would occur near Walker Lake is low. Risks to plants and animals from transporting mercury to the Hawthorne Army Depot under the Consolidated Storage Alternative would be negligible to moderate for the entire route traveled. As noted, moderate ecological risks would occur if the accident caused a fire during a rain event, which is unlikely in a dry climate. Therefore, the limited probability that an accident with fire would occur while it is raining, the relatively short transportation distances near Walker Lake, and the negligible risk from spills without a fire, suggests that the risks from transportation accidents are likely to be lower than that estimated in the MM EIS.

AC-3. ALTERNATIVE – CONSOLIDATED STORAGE – PEZ LAKE DEVELOPMENT

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors expressed concerns regarding consolidated mercury storage at the PEZ Lake Development near Romulus, New York. One commentor suggested that storage in the igloos on the former Seneca Army Depot should be evaluated.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC has safely stored mercury for over 50 years. The PEZ Lake Development site in Romulus, New York, is analyzed in the MM EIS as one of the sites representing a range of environmental and socioeconomic settings; however, this site is no longer under consideration as a consolidated storage site. The Advantage Group, which manages and will own the site, withdrew it from consideration based on business and site development plans.

Storage in igloos at the former Seneca Army Depot was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because the land containing the igloos has been set aside for conservation/recreation purposes. As described in Section 2.2.2.4, storage in igloos at the Hawthorne Army Depot is evaluated.

AE-1. ALTERNATIVE – ELIMINATED – CANDIDATE SITES

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors were concerned about how the candidate sites were selected for the Consolidated Storage Alternative. Other commentors suggested that additional sites be evaluated, including other military bases and the U.S. Department of Energy's Y–12 site.

DNSC RESPONSE: As described in Section 2.2.2, DNSC identified potential mercury storage sites by asking the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) and other Federal agencies to propose sites, visiting proposed sites, and applying screening criteria that included environmental conditions, site infrastructure, and availability of environmental documentation.

To notify Federal agencies of its search, DNSC published an "Expression of Interest, Alternative Locations for the Long Term Storage of Mercury" in the March 5, 2001, *Federal Register*. After the notice was issued, DNSC sent a letter to Federal land management agencies reiterating its storage requirements and requesting a response. The Office of the Under Secretary of Defense also issued a memorandum that requested DoD organizations to determine if they had potentially suitable sites.

DNSC developed site-screening criteria to select representative sites for analysis in the MM EIS. The screening criteria included, but were not limited to, aspects of site infrastructure, environmental conditions, and the availability of environmental documentation. The criteria identified preferred site characteristics and, where meaningful, provided qualitative measures.

Preliminary visits were made to six sites. During these visits, DNSC personnel made preliminary assessments of the quality and adequacy of site environmental information, as well as the suitability of the facility for consolidated long-term storage. Each site was evaluated against the site screening criteria. Three sites met the criteria to a higher degree than the others—Hawthorne Army Depot, PEZ Lake Development, and Utah Industrial Depot.

The selected sites, along with the three existing storage depots, afford a wide variety of environmental conditions. In addition, because they are in different parts of the United States, a range of transportation distances can be analyzed. DNSC determined that the six sites would cover the range of environmental impacts that need to be evaluated for consolidation. Analysis of these sites does not preclude the selection of other sites in the future, via an appropriate contractual process. If a site is considered for selection that was not evaluated in the MM EIS, an environmental review, tiering off the EIS, would be conducted. At this time, DNSC does not have a preferred consolidation site.

Y–12 is not a candidate site because it does not have enough space for all the mercury, and long-term mercury storage is not part of Y–12's national security mission. The Hawthorne Army Depot in Nevada is the only military site that was submitted for consideration by DoD.

AE-2. ALTERNATIVE – ELIMINATED – TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: A few commentors questioned why treatment and disposal of the mercury was not being evaluated. One commentor suggested that mercury could be combined with sulfur to form mercury sulfide. Another commentor suggested that DNSC should perform research and testing to find a way to treat and dispose of the mercury.

DNSC RESPONSE: Section 2.4.2 cites the fact that elemental mercury is the preferred form for most industrial uses that require mercury. It also states that the treatment and storage alternative would result in additional environmental impacts and costs, without significant benefits, during initial processing (stabilization), storage, and conversion (reclamation) back into elemental mercury at the end of the storage period. Therefore, this alternative is not fully analyzed in the MM EIS.

Mercury can be combined with sulfur to form mercury sulfide, a form of mercury found in some ores. DNSC considered evaluating an alternative that would have utilized mercury treatment and disposal in a qualified landfill. As discussed in Section 2.4.3, a number of technologies for treating mercury were evaluated. However, preliminary research indicated that at present there are no commercially available technologies that could render large quantities of elemental mercury more stable or less toxic in preparation for disposal. Based on the absence of mature technology and a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency-approved path forward for treatment and disposal of elemental mercury, DNSC elected not to pursue this alternative. If treatment technology becomes available in the future, it is possible that stored mercury could be disposed as discussed in Section 2.4.

DNSC does not have the responsibility or the authority to conduct research to identify a safe disposal option, and pursuit of such an option is beyond the scope of the MM EIS. If a viable treatment technology were to become available in the future, DNSC could consider its applicability to any DNSC mercury in storage at that time.

AG-1. ALTERNATIVE – GENERAL – COMPARISON OF IMPACTS

ISSUE SUMMARY: A number of commentors suggested that one alternative would result in fewer impacts than other alternatives.

DNSC RESPONSE: Table 2–3 provides a comparison of the impacts of the mercury management alternatives. Overall, this table shows that there are few discriminating factors among the alternatives and little difference in impacts and risks.

The analysis indicates that the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of all the alternatives would be negligible to minor. In addition, human health and ecological risks from normal operations would be negligible for all the alternatives. Human health and ecological risks from facility accidents would be moderate for the Consolidated Storage and Sales Alternatives, and negligible to low for the No Action Alternative. The Sale of Mercury to Reduce Mercury Mining Alternative could also produce beneficial impacts by reducing environmental impacts and risks from mercury mining and refining.

Human health and ecological risks from transportation would be moderate to high for the Sales Alternative due to the greater distances involved. Risks from transportation would be low to moderate for

the Consolidated Storage Alternative. There would be no transportation risk for the No Action Alternative.

The No Action and Consolidated Storage Alternatives would be the most expensive. The Sales Alternative would be the least expensive because they would generate income by selling the mercury stockpile.

AG-2. ALTERNATIVE – GENERAL – HYBRID

ISSUE SUMMARY: A few commentors suggested that a hybrid alternative should be considered.

DNSC RESPONSE: Section 1.3 notes that a hybrid alternative, combining the Consolidated Storage and Sales Alternatives, could be selected. DNSC could also select a two-site Consolidated Storage Alternative where mercury would be consolidated at two sites for long-term storage. The environmental impacts of hybrid alternatives would be bounded by impacts evaluated in the MM EIS.

AN-1. ALTERNATIVE – NO ACTION – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: Many commentors were opposed to the No Action Alternative. The most frequently cited reasons for opposition included concerns about:

- Human health risks from leaks, accidents, and terrorist acts
- Proximity of the storage locations to populated areas
- Adverse effects on property values and negative perceptions affecting economic growth in the surrounding communities
- Adverse effects on the environment

Some commentors were in favor of this alternative with the belief that the current operations at the respective mercury storage sites were safe and secure.

DNSC RESPONSE: As discussed in Section 2.3, DNSC's preferred alternative is consolidated storage at one location. Decisions on mercury management will be based on the environmental analyses presented in the EIS, including health and safety, security, and socioeconomics, and other factors such as cost, strategic considerations, and public input. DNSC will announce its decisions and the reasons for them in the Record of Decision (ROD), which will be published no earlier than 30 days after publication of the Final MM EIS Notice of Availability. The ROD may specify the Consolidated Storage Alternative (preferred alternative), No Action Alternative, Sales Alternative, or a combination of these alternatives (hybrid alternative).

Because mercury is a hazardous material, DNSC imposes strict controls to prevent exposure or release to the environment or to personnel working in the storage locations. The *Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Report for the Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement* (DLA 2004) was prepared to support the MM EIS. The results of this risk assessment are included in the MM EIS. As described in Chapter 4 and summarized in Section 2.5 of the MM EIS, risks to the public from mercury released during facility accidents would be negligible to low at any of the candidate sites for all the alternatives considered. Mercury vapors that might escape from the storage facility after an accident would be diluted to low concentrations before reaching the public. This includes mercury that could be released during natural disasters such as earthquakes and tornadoes and human-initiated spills, leaks, and other accidents. Populations residing near the candidate sites are unlikely to face a major public health threat. This is because the risks are already negligible to low for an individual member of the public

under the worst conditions that can reasonably be expected, and thus the risks for the general public would be even lower.

As described in the Chapter 4 water resources subsections, plans are in place should a leak or spill occur. The existing mercury storage locations have approved Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plans and Installation Spill Contingency Plans to ensure that the appropriate response to a spill is made. The workforce at the mercury storage locations is trained to respond to mercury spills. State and local emergency response teams are aware of the mercury storage. Should there be a mercury spill, it would be cleaned up to applicable standards.

DNSC provides armed security, perimeter fencing, and closely controlled access at the depots. DNSC also works with local authorities to ensure that even the most unlikely scenarios would be handled properly. DNSC has prepared a risk analysis of a deliberate aircraft crash and conducted vulnerability assessments to ensure that the mercury storage depots remain safe and secure. These internal reports, which indicate that the mercury stockpile is not a likely target for terrorists, are not available to the public for security reasons.

DNSC has worked with the public throughout the EIS process to help them understand the potential risks presented by the No Action Alternative so that opinions can be formulated based on facts and not perception. DNSC has safely stored mercury for more than 50 years and has taken additional precautions to ensure that it continues to be stored safely over the next 40 years by overpacking the mercury in steel drums and making modifications to the storage buildings. Sections 1.2.3 and 2.2.1 describe mercury storage at the existing locations. As summarized above, the analyses indicate that there is negligible risk to the public associated with continued mercury storage at the existing locations.

There would be no new construction and therefore no impacts on the environment from land-disturbing activities. As described in Chapter 4 and summarized in Section 2.5, negligible environmental impacts would result from activities associated with the No Action Alternative.

As described in Section 1.5, DNSC has supported a vigorous public outreach program. DNSC has hosted 12 public meetings nationwide, and provided information on the MM EIS in the form of newsletters, fact sheets, reports, exhibits, and a Web site. Email and toll-free telephone and fax numbers have been available for public queries and comments. Postcards were sent to households in the immediate vicinity of potential storage sites to inform them of public meetings and comment opportunities. DNSC has also provided briefings for state and local officials and others in communities potentially affected by mercury management activities, and will continue to inform communities affected by the mercury management alternative that is selected.

AP-1. ALTERNATIVE – PREFERRED – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors questioned how the preferred alternative was selected and if DNSC has selected a preferred site for consolidated storage.

DNSC RESPONSE: As discussed in Section 2.3, DNSC's preferred alternative is consolidated mercury storage at one location. DNSC has selected the Consolidated Storage Alternative because it meets all DNSC objectives as stated in Section 1.3.

DNSC has not selected a consolidated mercury storage site from among the six candidate sites evaluated in the MM EIS. No other candidate sites have been identified, although the PEZ Lake Development in Romulus, New York, is no longer under consideration because the new owners have different plans for its use. The U.S. Department of Energy's Y–12 site is not a candidate site because it does not have enough

space for all the mercury, and long-term storage of mercury is not part of Y–12's national security mission. As described in Section 2.3, the analysis of candidate sites in the MM EIS does not preclude selection of another site in the future. However, a site not evaluated would likely require additional environmental documentation and public notification and review.

Decisions on mercury management will be based on the environmental analyses presented in the EIS, including health and safety, security, and socioeconomics, and other factors such as cost, strategic considerations, and public input. DNSC will announce its decisions and the reasons for them in the Record of Decision (ROD), which will be published no earlier than 30 days after publication of the Final MM EIS Notice of Availability. The ROD may specify the Consolidated Storage Alternative (preferred alternative), No Action Alternative, Sales Alternative, or a combination of these alternatives (hybrid alternative).

AP-2. ALTERNATIVE – PREFERRED – SALES

ISSUE SUMMARY: One commentor believes that the Sales Alternative is the only viable solution to mercury management.

DNSC RESPONSE: As described in Section 2.2, the MM EIS analyzes three viable alternatives; No Action, Consolidated Storage, and Sales. Consolidated storage is DNSC's preferred alternative because it could facilitate plans to close depots as well as provide safe, long-term mercury management with negligible-to-minor environmental impacts, and economies of scale. Section 1.3 notes that a combined alternative (hybrid alternative) could also be chosen.

Under the Consolidated Storage Alternative, the mercury could remain in storage well beyond the projected closure dates of the existing DNSC mercury storage depots. As described in Section 1.2.1, despite closure plans one or more depots could be kept open, if required.

In the future, mercury may be required for legitimate uses, or if commercial uses no longer exist, mercury may be treated and disposed. Currently, there are no plans to move the mercury after the 40-year storage period. If the Consolidated Storage Alternative is selected, extension of the storage period or other options for mercury management would be evaluated in appropriate environmental documentation before the end of the 40-year storage period.

As described in Section 2.2.3, DNSC is prohibited under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of 1939, as amended (50 U.S.C. 98 et seq.) from selling mercury—and all other DNSC commodities—at a rate that would unduly disrupt the markets. Two subalternatives are described in Section 2.2.3: (1) sales at the maximum allowable market rate (assumed to be 5,000 flasks per year), and (2) sales to reduce mercury mining. Both alternatives restrict the rate of mercury sales to avoid undue disruption of the market. Section 4.4.1 states that for the Sale of Mercury at the Maximum Allowable Market Rate Alternative, the truck or rail trips would be expected to occur over a period of 26 years. Section 4.5.1.1 states that for the Sales to Reduce Mercury Mining Alternative, the truck or rail trips would be expected to occur over a period of a few months.

AS-1. ALTERNATIVE – SALES – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: A number of commentors expressed support for the Sales Alternative. Some suggested a hybrid alternative that would include consolidated storage and sale of all or a portion of the inventory from the consolidated storage location. A few commentors suggested that the sale of existing mercury stockpiles would be preferable to new mercury mining.

Others were concerned about or opposed the sale of mercury. Some commentors said that any mercury sold on the open market would increase the amount of mercury in the global environment. Some expressed concern that sales of large quantities of mercury would depress mercury prices and result in the increased use of mercury. One commentor believed that in a previous meeting DNSC made the claim that sale of excess mercury would upset the world market and displaced mercury miners in South America would turn to raising cocoa beans for a living. Other commentors questioned whether DNSC mercury is a marketable commodity or a hazardous waste.

DNSC RESPONSE: As described in Section 2.2.3, DNSC is prohibited under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of 1939, as amended (50 U.S.C. 98 et seq.) from selling mercury—and all other DNSC commodities—at a rate that would unduly disrupt the markets. Two subalternatives are described in Section 2.2.3: (1) sales at the maximum allowable market rate (assumed to be 5,000 flasks per year), and (2) sales to reduce mercury mining. Both alternatives restrict the rate of mercury sales to avoid undue disruption of the market. Section 2.4.4 indicates that unrestricted sales were considered but eliminated from detailed study. Unrestricted sales are considered to be unreasonable because it could result in undue disruption of the world mercury market. DNSC suspended sales of mercury in 1994 because of concerns expressed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Congress about accumulation of mercury in the global environment.

The *Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Report for the Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement* (DLA 2004) was prepared to support the MM EIS. The results of this risk assessment are included in the MM EIS. As described in Sections 4.4 and 4.5 and summarized in Section 2.5 of the MM EIS, there would be negligible-to-minor environmental and socioeconomic impacts from the Sales Alternative. Risks to the public from normal operations and facility accidents would be negligible to low. Section 1.3 notes that a hybrid alternative, combining the Consolidated Storage and Sales Alternatives, could be selected. The environmental impacts of hybrid alternatives would be bounded by impacts evaluated in the MM EIS.

As discussed in Section 2.2.3.2, the entire inventory of DNSC excess mercury could be sold to a mercury mining company with the agreement that mining would be reduced proportionately to compensate for the release of the DNSC mercury into the market. In the event the mercury is sold, it is expected that an agreement would be negotiated that would require the purchaser to sell DNSC mercury at a rate no greater than the rate of sale for newly mined mercury. Therefore, this alternative would meet the requirements of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of 1939, as amended (50 U.S.C. 98 et seq.) that sales would not result in undue disruption of the mercury market. European producers of chlorine and alkali are also considering this approach (CEC 2002:9-12). As described in Section 4.5 and summarized in Section 2.5, the Sales to Reduce Mercury Mining Alternative could produce beneficial impacts by reducing impacts of mercury mining and refining. DNSC is unaware of any correlation between mercury sales and drug trafficking.

As described in Sections 1.1 and 2.1, DNSC mercury is not a waste; it is a marketable commodity that is 99.5 percent to 99.9 percent pure. Mercury of this quality is currently bought and sold on the open market for uses such as thermometers, barometers, blood pressure monitors, switches, light bulbs, dental fillings, and medicines, among others. Mercury is designated a hazardous substance under Section 307(a) of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), Section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), and U.S. Department of Transportation hazardous materials regulations (49 CFR 172.101).

CB-1. COST/BENEFIT – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors questioned the validity of the mercury storage cost estimates and asked why the estimated costs differ greatly among the candidate sites.

DNSC RESPONSE: Cost estimates have been revised in the Final MM EIS. Facility cost estimates provided in the Draft MM EIS were based on actual square foot and other costs being paid by the Government at or near the properties being considered as possible consolidation sites. Commentors on the Draft EIS noted that these estimated costs, particularly for the Western sites, appeared higher than would be expected. DNSC analyzed the basis for these estimates and found that the costs included assumptions that were not consistent for all locations. For these reasons, DNSC decided to treat basic facility costs generically. Actual facility costs in the event that the long-term consolidated storage alternative is chosen would be established based on best value to the Government during a procurement process.

CB-2. COST/BENEFIT – FUNDING OTHER PROGRAMS

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor suggested that DNSC should sell the mercury stockpile and use the proceeds to pay for remediation of a uranium mill tailings site.

DNSC RESPONSE: The authority to allocate funds from the sale of stockpile commodities lies with Congress, not with DNSC.

CB-3. COST/BENEFIT – FUNDING MERCURY MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

ISSUE SUMMARY: A few commentors asked who would pay for 40 years of storage of the DNSC mercury stockpile. Another commentor asked who would fund the state and local government oversight of the mercury stockpile.

DNSC RESPONSE: The costs associated with consolidated mercury storage at any of the candidate sites would be borne by the Federal Government. Costs of the mercury management alternatives are described in Appendix D and summarized in Section 2.5.2. The costs of state and local regulatory programs are the responsibility of the regulating agencies.

CR-1. CULTURAL RESOURCES – WARREN DEPOT

ISSUE SUMMARY: The Ohio Historic Preservation Office noted that previous cultural resource studies have determined that no historic properties are located on the Warren Depot.

DNSC RESPONSE: If the Warren Depot is selected as the consolidated storage location and historic properties were discovered during site modification, DNSC would contact the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.) and 36 CFR 800.13.

CR-2. CULTURAL RESOURCES – SOMERVILLE DEPOT

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor was concerned about impacts to the heritage of the communities near the Somerville Depot. The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's Historic Preservation Office's review indicates that there are no properties listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) within the Somerville Depot.

DNSC RESPONSE: As noted in Section 3.3.8 and supported by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's Historic Preservation Office's review, no prehistoric or historic archeological properties that are eligible for listing on the NRHP were identified at the Somerville Depot. The only property near the depot eligible for listing on the NRHP is the Duke Estate, which is located directly north. Furthermore, if the Somerville Depot is selected for consolidated mercury storage, any necessary

modifications to the site would not require ground disturbance, therefore impacts on cultural resources are not likely. However, if historic properties were discovered during mercury management activities, DNSC would contact the Historic Preservation Office in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.) and 36 CFR 800.13.

CR-3. CULTURAL RESOURCES – HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT

ISSUE SUMMARY: The Nevada Department of Cultural Affairs requested that DNSC consult with their State Historic Preservation Officer if the Hawthorne Army Depot is selected as the consolidated storage location.

DNSC RESPONSE: If the Hawthorne Army Depot is selected as the consolidated storage location, consultation with the Nevada Department of Cultural Affairs would take place, as appropriate, in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.) and 36 CFR 800.13.

CR-4. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Y–12 NATIONAL SECURITY COMPLEX

ISSUE SUMMARY: The Tennessee Historical Commission has no objection to the implementation of this project because implementation would not adversely impact any property eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

DNSC RESPONSE: If historic properties were discovered during mercury management activities, DNSC would contact the Tennessee Historical Commission in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.) and 36 CFR 800.13.

CR-5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – NEW HAVEN DEPOT

ISSUE SUMMARY: The Indiana Department of Natural Resources' analysis supports the assessment that no impacts on cultural resources are expected.

DNSC RESPONSE: If historic properties were discovered during mercury management activities, DNSC would contact the Indiana Department of Natural Resources in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.) and 36 CFR 800.13.

DM-1. DECISIONS TO BE MADE/RECORD OF DECISION – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors asked how a decision would be made. Another commentor asked how long it would take to move the mercury once a decision is made.

DNSC RESPONSE: Decisions on mercury management will be based on the environmental analyses presented in the MM EIS, including health and safety, security, and socioeconomics, and other factors such as cost, strategic considerations, and public input. DNSC will announce its decisions and the reasons for them in the Record of Decision (ROD), which will be published no earlier than 30 days after publication of the Final MM EIS Notice of Availability. The ROD may specify the Consolidated Storage Alternative (preferred alternative), No Action Alternative, Sales Alternative, or a combination of these alternatives (hybrid alternative).

If the preferred alternative is selected, the ROD may or may not specify one of the candidate sites analyzed in the MM EIS. If one of the candidate sites is not specified, additional time would be needed to

identify another storage location and to prepare additional environmental documentation. Section 2.2.2 notes that it is likely that it would take no more than a year to stage and transport the mercury to a consolidated storage location.

DM-2. DECISIONS TO BE MADE/RECORD OF DECISION – POPULATION

ISSUE SUMMARY: Many commentors suggested that proximity to populated areas should be a major factor in the decision.

DNSC RESPONSE: The MM EIS presents information on population density in Section 3.1, and the affected environment sections on socioeconomics, environmental justice, and transportation. Populations residing near the candidate sites are unlikely to face a major public health threat. This is because the risks are already negligible to low for an individual member of the public under the worst conditions that can reasonably be expected, and thus the risks for the general public would be even lower.

DM-3. DECISIONS TO BE MADE/RECORD OF DECISION – REMOVAL OF MERCURY

ISSUE SUMMARY: Many commentors wanted the mercury removed from the existing storage locations immediately.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC cannot remove the mercury from the current storage locations at this time. The National Environmental Policy Act prohibits other actions during the EIS process. To paraphrase 40 CFR 1506.1(a), until an agency issues a record of decision, no action concerning the proposal shall be taken which would (1) have an adverse environmental impact, or (2) limit the choice of reasonable alternatives. DNSC interprets these regulations to preclude doing anything while the MM EIS is pending that would in any way limit the choice of reasonable alternatives under consideration. One of the choices is the No Action Alternative (i.e., continued storage at current mercury storage locations). Therefore, DNSC cannot move the mercury until the MM EIS process is complete.

DD-1. DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor asked if DNSC has a closure plan for the mercury storage buildings. Another commentor asked what would happen to the mercury at the end of the 40-year storage period.

DNSC RESPONSE: Were mercury to be removed from any storage depot, the storage facilities would be decontaminated and decommissioned from mercury storage use and released for other storage uses or disposition. Although a plan has not been prepared, Section 4.6 describes the general process that would occur.

These procedures are conservative because little or no contamination of the building interior would be anticipated. None of the existing mercury storage buildings is known to have major contamination, and future contamination is unlikely because the mercury would be stored in flasks overpacked inside airtight 30-gal (114-l) drums. As an added precaution, the warehouse floors would be sealed to be resistant to mercury contamination in the event of a leak or spill, making surface cleanup all that would be necessary.

If the No Action Alternative or Consolidated Storage Alternative is selected, extension of the storage period or other options for mercury management would be evaluated in appropriate National Environmental Policy Act documentation before the end of the 40-year storage period.

EC-1. ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES – ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors expressed concern about potential impacts of the stored mercury on the environment, particularly impacts on surface waters such as lakes and rivers and on groundwater, as well as impacts on fish and other wildlife.

DNSC RESPONSE: There would be no new construction and therefore no impacts on the environment from land-disturbing activities. As described in Chapter 4 and summarized in Section 2.5, negligible-to-minor environmental impacts would result from activities associated with the alternatives considered.

EC-2. ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES – NEW HAVEN DEPOT

ISSUE SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service identified three federally listed threatened, endangered, or candidate species whose range includes Allen County, Indiana. However, as also noted by the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, the New Haven Depot itself does not provide habitat for any federally or state-listed threatened, endangered, or rare plant or animal species. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was concerned about potential impacts of these species along the transportation routes to the New Haven Depot.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC appreciates the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Indiana Department of Natural Resources' assistance regarding identification of federally and state-listed threatened, endangered, or rare plant or animal species in the vicinity of the New Haven Depot. The Final MM EIS has been updated to include the information supplied.

Because existing truck and rail routes would be used regardless of the alternative selected, it is unlikely that transporting the mercury to the New Haven Depot would jeopardize listed species or destroy or adversely modify critical habitat. As discussed in Section 4.3.1, truck and rail traffic would not be expected to result in a change in noise levels along the shipping routes that would be noticeable or result in an increase in annoyance. Section 4.3.6 evaluates reasonable scenarios for truck and rail transportation accidents. The likelihood that a traffic accident would occur near the New Haven Depot is low. Risks to plants and animals range from negligible to moderate for the entire route traveled. The moderate risk occurs for a truck or railcar fire when it is raining. However, the probability that an accident with fire would occur while it is raining and the negligible risk from spills without a fire, suggests that the ecological risks from transportation accidents are likely to be lower than estimated.

EC-3. ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES – SOMERVILLE DEPOT

ISSUE SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service noted that no federally listed or proposed threatened or endangered flora or fauna are known to occur within the vicinity of the Somerville Depot with the exception of the occasional transient bald eagle. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was concerned about impacts along the transportation routes to the Somerville Depot. The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection noted the presence of state-listed threatened and endangered species' habitat in the vicinity of the Somerville Depot and their opinion that the proposed mercury management actions would not result in any adverse impacts on state-listed species of concern.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC appreciates the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's assistance in confirming that there are no federally listed or proposed threatened or endangered flora or fauna known to occur within the vicinity of the Somerville Depot with the exception of the occasional transient bald eagle. However, as indicated in Section 3.3.7.2, several state-listed species have been identified within a 2-mi (3.2-km) radius of the depot.

DNSC would seek a formal Section 7 consultation if the Somerville Depot is selected for consolidated mercury storage. Because existing truck and rail routes would be used regardless of the alternative selected, it is unlikely that transporting the mercury to the Somerville Depot would jeopardize listed species or destroy or adversely modify critical habitat. As discussed in Section 4.3.1, truck and rail traffic would not be expected to result in a change in noise levels along the shipping routes that would be noticeable or result in an increase in annoyance. Section 4.3.6 evaluates reasonable scenarios for truck and rail transportation accidents. The likelihood that a traffic accident would occur near the Somerville Depot is low. Risks to plants and animals range from negligible to moderate for the entire route traveled. The moderate risk occurs for a truck or railcar fire when it is raining. However, the probability that an accident with fire would occur while it is raining, the relatively short transportation distances near the Somerville Depot, and the negligible risk from spills without a fire, suggests that the ecological risks from transportation accidents are likely to be lower than estimated.

DNSC appreciates the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's assistance regarding identification of state-listed endangered and threatened species in the vicinity of the Somerville Depot. The Final MM EIS has been updated to include the information supplied.

EC-4. ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES – WARREN DEPOT

ISSUE SUMMARY: The Ohio Department of Natural Resources noted that the Warren Depot was located in the historical range of federally and/or state-listed endangered, threatened, or candidate species—five birds, three mammals, one mollusk, and one reptile.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC appreciates the Ohio Department of Natural Resources' assistance in identifying potential federally and/or state-listed threatened, endangered, or candidate animal species in the vicinity of the Warren Depot. Further investigation indicates that there are 25 state-listed threatened, endangered, or candidate plant species in Trumbull County. The Final MM EIS has been updated to include this information. However, as indicated in Section 3.4.7.2, a survey did not locate any endangered, threatened, or rare animal or plant species on site or in the vicinity of the depot.

EO-1. EIS PRESENTATION AND ORGANIZATION – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor asked that Section ES.8 include more information on DNSC's evaluation of available elemental mercury treatment technologies as described in Section 2.4.3.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC believes that the level of detail presented in the Executive Summary is adequate. Please refer to Section 2.4.3 for more detailed information.

ER-1. EMERGENCY RESPONSE – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors were concerned about the local emergency response capabilities and who would pay to cleanup an accident.

DNSC RESPONSE: Plans are in place should an emergency occur. DNSC maintains equipment and trains the workforce at its mercury storage locations to respond to mercury spills. The mercury storage sites would have approved Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plans and Installation Spill Contingency Plans to ensure that the appropriate response to a spill is made. Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations require preparation of Material Safety Data Sheets. Material Safety Data Sheets have been developed and would be shared with emergency response agencies at all storage locations. State and local emergency response teams would be aware of the mercury storage and prepared to respond if an accident were to occur. The immediate concern for an emergency hazardous material

response would be to contain the mercury and minimize exposure to those on the scene. Mitigation efforts in the aftermath of the emergency would be less time-critical. DNSC would be responsible for the cost of the cleanup, and the proper disposal of waste generated as a result of an emergency situation involving the mercury stockpile at a DNSC facility.

As discussed in Section 4.3.5 and summarized in Section 2.5.1.5, analyses indicate that there would be negligible-to-low risk to the public from mercury storage facility accidents. This estimate of negligible-to-low risk does not account for any mitigation by an emergency response team.

ER-2. EMERGENCY RESPONSE – UTAH INDUSTRIAL DEPOT

ISSUE SUMMARY: Several commentors were concerned about how an accident would be handled at the Utah Industrial Depot, and that the depot does not have adequate emergency response capabilities and plans.

DNSC RESPONSE: As indicated in Section 3.8.4.3, the Utah Industrial Depot maintains a *Fire and Hazardous Material Emergency Response Plan* for fire, hazardous materials releases, and other emergencies. Arrangements for upgrades to the facility and other services (e.g., security, emergency response, and monitoring) that are necessary for maintaining the mercury stockpile would be a matter of business negotiations by the Utah Industrial Depot and DNSC as the prospective tenant.

As discussed in Section 3.8.4.3, small leaks would be managed on site by trained technicians. The depot would fulfill initial responsibilities by notifying the Tooele City Fire Department, Tooele County Hazmat, and/or emergency medical personnel through 911 emergency reporting. As discussed in Section 3.8.10.5, the first calls for assistance would go to the Tooele City Fire Department, located approximately 3 mi (4.8 km) from the depot. The Tooele Army Depot Fire Department would be a secondary responder. DNSC would be responsible for the cost of the cleanup, and the proper disposal of waste generated as a result of an emergency situation involving the mercury stockpile.

EP-1. ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS, PERMITS, AND CONSULTATIONS – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: A few commentors asked who would provide regulatory oversight of a mercury storage facility.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC mercury will remain U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) property, and DoD will continue to fund and oversee the mercury storage operations. The storage facility would be required to comply with all applicable Federal and state laws and regulations.

EP-2. ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS, PERMITS, AND CONSULTATIONS – WALKER RIVER AGREEMENT

ISSUE SUMMARY: The Walker River Paiute Tribe believed that the agreement settling the case of the United States and the Walker River Paiute Tribe versus the Southern Pacific Transportation Company prohibits the shipment of mercury by rail across the Reservation.

DNSC RESPONSE: The agreement restricts the transportation of radioactive nuclear waste over the railway. The agreement contains no other restriction on the type of material that can be shipped.

LU-1. LAND USE AND VISUAL RESOURCES – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor was concerned that mercury storage would be unsightly and could affect farmland near the storage site.

DNSC RESPONSE: As described in Chapter 4, none of the alternatives would likely affect offsite land uses and viewsheds from public vantage points in the vicinity of the storage location.

LU-2. LAND USE AND VISUAL RESOURCES – UTAH INDUSTRIAL DEPOT

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor was concerned that mercury storage at the Utah Industrial Depot would not be consistent with land use plans.

DNSC RESPONSE: As described in Section 3.8.9.1, mercury storage is consistent with zoning for the Utah Industrial Depot.

NP-1. NEPA PROCESS/ADEQUACY – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: Several commentors were concerned that the Draft MM EIS did not meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). A commentor questioned if the proper environmental issues were evaluated.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC prepared the MM EIS in accordance with the provisions of NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and the related Council on Environmental Quality and DNSC implementation regulations (40 CFR 1500 through 1508 and DLAR 1000.22, respectively). The MM EIS provides a comprehensive description of excess mercury management alternatives and their potential impacts on the natural and manmade environment. As described in Section 4.1, impact analyses were performed for all disciplines where the potential exists for effects on the environment. These include: meteorology, air quality and noise, waste management, socioeconomics, human health and ecological risk from normal operations, human health and ecological risk from facility accidents, transportation, geology and soils, water resources, ecological resources, cultural resources, land use and visual resources, infrastructure, and environmental justice. DNSC has analyzed each environmental resource area in a consistent manner across all the alternatives to allow for a fair comparison among the alternatives and among the sites. The environmental analyses are based on information collected and evaluated using sound scientific principles.

Section 309 of the Clean Air Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) requires the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to review and comment in writing on the environmental effects of agency proposals. EPA reviewed and rated the Draft MM EIS and assigned a Lack of Objections (LO) rating to the proposed action. An LO is EPA's best rating. EPA did not identify any significant environmental concerns related to DNSC's Preferred Alternative. EPA's review states that the Draft MM EIS provides adequate documentation and suitable analysis upon which to base a decision. A copy of the EPA letter (Comment Document No. 27) is included in the written comments in Chapter 2 of this volume.

NP-2. NEPA PROCESS/ADEQUACY – U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

ISSUE SUMMARY: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) assigned a Lack of Objections (LO) rating to the Draft MM EIS.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC appreciates EPA's LO rating for the Draft MM EIS.

NP-3. NEPA PROCESS/ADEQUACY – LOCAL EXPERTS

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor suggested that local experts should have been consulted.

DNSC RESPONSE: While it may be true that local experts have useful information to contribute, and DNSC has welcomed such inputs, as a Federal agency, DNSC must evaluate all alternatives and candidate sites equally and objectively. As required by the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the public comment process has provided the opportunity for local experts to be heard.

NP-4. NEPA PROCESS/ADEQUACY – NO COMMENT

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors stated that they had no comments on the MM EIS.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC acknowledges the commentors' assessment of the Draft MM EIS.

NP-5. NEPA PROCESS/ADEQUACY – SCHEDULE

ISSUE SUMMARY: Several commentors asked why the MM EIS process was taking so long.

DNSC RESPONSE: As a Federal agency, DNSC must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), which requires the agency to identify and analyze the environmental impacts of a range of reasonable alternatives prior to making a decision. In the case of mercury management, the identification and evaluation of alternatives was a lengthy process, especially the effort to identify additional candidate consolidation sites. Once sites were identified and screened for inclusion in the EIS, the analysis has moved expeditiously and the NEPA process should be concluded in early 2004.

OS-1. OTHER SITE ISSUES – COMMUNITY ACCEPTANCE

ISSUE SUMMARY: The commentor provided suggestions for a number of ways to make a consolidated mercury storage site more acceptable to the local communities.

DNSC RESPONSE: The commentor's suggestions will be considered during the decisionmaking and implementation phases of the process.

OS-2. OTHER SITE ISSUES – CONTAMINATION

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors were concerned about mercury, arsenic, and lead contamination at the New Haven Depot.

DNSC RESPONSE: Mercury, arsenic, and lead are naturally occurring elements and therefore may be present at low levels in the environment. As described in Sections 3.2.5 and 3.2.6.1, no elevated concentrations of mercury were detected in the soil, surface water, or sediment samples at the New Haven Depot. Elevated concentrations of lead were detected in soil and sediment samples. These concentrations may be associated with outside storage of lead ingots. Elevated concentrations of arsenic and lead are being investigated by the ongoing Environmental Restoration Program. Where cleanup is determined to be necessary, it will be conducted in accordance with all applicable requirements.

OS-3. OTHER SITE ISSUES – OUT OF SCOPE

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors suggested that the depot be closed. Others suggested that other commodities be removed from the existing storage locations. Some commentors were concerned about non-DNSC wastes and hazardous materials in their communities. Another commentor believed the incinerator at Tooele is not safe.

DNSC RESPONSE: Requests for depot closure, other commodities stored at the depots, and management of other wastes and hazardous materials are beyond the scope of the MM EIS. The purpose of the MM EIS is to provide environmental input to the decision on the management of DNSC's excess mercury stockpile, conduct appropriate environmental studies before the action is taken, and obtain public input in the decisionmaking process.

With regard to concerns about heavy metals storage, Congress has declared most DNSC commodities excess to U.S. defense needs, and since 1993, DNSC has been selling off the stockpile at a rate of about $500 million per year. Therefore, the DNSC inventory is substantially reduced every year. However, DNSC suspended sales of mercury in 1994 because of concerns expressed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Congress about accumulation of mercury in the global environment.

OS-4. OTHER SITE ISSUES – RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor was concerned about the storage of radioactive materials at the New Haven Depot.

DNSC RESPONSE: Storage of radioactive materials is beyond the scope of the MM EIS. The New Haven Depot possesses a license from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the storage of radioactive materials. Columbium-tantalum ore is the only radioactive material currently stored at the depot. This material is a slightly radioactive natural ore and not a nuclear waste.

Baddeleyite ore contamination along the roads, rail scale, and railroad tracks was cleaned up in fiscal year 2003. Cleanup of the former baddeleyite ore storage site is scheduled for fiscal year 2004.

OS-5. OTHER SITE ISSUES – ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

ISSUE SUMMARY: A few commentors were concerned about existing contamination at the current DNSC mercury storage locations. Other commentors were concerned that mercury storage could slow cleanup activities at a given site.

DNSC RESPONSE: As described in Section 1.7.2, cleanup of existing environmental contamination at the DNSC depots is ongoing. DNSC uses the four-step approach required under the Defense Environmental Restoration Program. The goal is to identify and characterize contamination and restore depot property. The first two steps focus on identifying possible environmental problems. The three DNSC depots (New Haven, Somerville, and Warren) are currently at the third step, where the investigations are being expanded to define the nature and extent of suspected contamination. The fourth step involves actual cleanup (remediation). The environmental restoration process is progressing independent of the decision on mercury management.

PO-1. POLICY (DLA, DNSC, DOE, EPA) – APPROVAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: A few commentors believed that DNSC should get state approval to store mercury within the state.

DNSC RESPONSE: Since the beginning of the MM EIS process, DNSC has supported a vigorous public outreach program. In addition to 12 public meetings, DNSC has provided information in the form of newsletters, fact sheets, reports, exhibits, and a Web site. DNSC has also conducted briefings for state and local public officials in communities potentially affected by mercury management activities. Although state approval is not required, DNSC intends to continue to be accessible and to provide information as it completes the decisionmaking process.

PO-2. POLICY (DLA, DNSC, DOE, EPA) – MERCURY

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors asked if DNSC planned on acquiring additional mercury. Other commentors suggested that DNSC should plan for storage of additional non-DNSC mercury that may be retired from the mercury thermometer collection programs and chlor-alkali plants.

DNSC RESPONSE: The National Defense Stockpile is a congressionally mandated program established for the stockpiling of essential industrial materials. Since Congress and the U.S. Department of Defense have declared mercury excess to current and anticipated needs, DNSC is focused on mercury disposition, not acquisition of additional inventory. Expansion of the storage facility to handle other mercury and ownership of that material is beyond the scope of the MM EIS and this decision process. DNSC is not now accepting or acquiring additional mercury from any source and has no authority or plans to accept or acquire additional mercury in the future. However, private companies are free to purchase mercury to fill their requirements.

The purpose of the MM EIS is to provide environmental input to the decision on the future management of DNSC stockpiled mercury. The future retirement of other surplus mercury and the ownership of that material are beyond the scope of the MM EIS and DNSC decisionmaking authority.

PO-3. POLICY (DLA, DNSC, DOE, EPA) – PRIVATIZATION

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor was concerned that a commercial facility would not be able to provide proper storage and security for the mercury stockpile.

DNSC RESPONSE: The Federal Government has successfully privatized many operations and is confident that mercury storage at a commercial facility would be successful. If consolidated storage at a commercial facility is selected, the mercury would continue to be owned, and its conditions monitored, by the Federal Government. In addition, U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) facilities are periodically evaluated to determine if they continue to provide good value for the Federal Government, and ultimately the taxpayer. There are no guarantees that DoD facilities will remain open.

PP-1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: Several commentors were concerned that adequate public notification was not provided for the public meetings on the Draft MM EIS. Some commentors were concerned that adequate public comment opportunities were not provided.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC is committed to communicating with the public to ensure that all affected communities have a full understanding of the proposed action and are given opportunities to participate in decisions that may affect them. Throughout the MM EIS process DNSC has conducted a vigorous public outreach program to inform the public and solicit input: 12 public meetings have been held at seven locations around the country; information has been provided in newsletters, fact sheets, exhibits, presentations, and a Web site (www.mercuryeis.com); and toll-free telephone and fax lines are available for comments and questions.

The Draft MM EIS public comment period was announced in local newspapers along with the public meeting time and place. In addition, postcards were mailed to persons living near the potentially affected sites to inform them of the public meeting and the comment period. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) regulations mandate a minimum 45-day comment period after the publication of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Notice of Availability of a draft EIS to provide an opportunity for the public to comment on the Draft MM EIS. The comment period on the Draft MM EIS that began on April 11, 2003, allowed the public more than twice the required number of days to comment. In order to provide interested parties with additional time to comment, the deadline for transmittal of comments was extended informally from July 18, 2003 (as stated in the *Federal Register* notice), to September 2, 2003. In addition, DNSC continued to address comments received after September 2 to the extent practicable in preparing the Final MM EIS. DNSC also participated in several meetings after the initial public meeting about the Draft MM EIS to address concerns expressed by the citizens of Utah.

Various means of communication (mail, toll-free telephone and fax lines, and Web site) have been provided to facilitate public comment. It is DNSC policy to encourage public input on these matters of national and international importance. DNSC is committed to providing the public with comprehensive environmental reviews of its proposed actions in accordance with NEPA and intends to continue to be accessible and to provide information as it completes the decisionmaking process.

PP-2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – COMMENTS

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor asked that DNSC consider the attached comments.

DNSC RESPONSE: As required by the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), any comments received during the public comment period will be considered in preparing the Final MM EIS.

PP-3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – EXTENSION OF COMMENT PERIOD

ISSUE SUMMARY: A few commentors asked for an extension of the public comment period.

DNSC RESPONSE: Because of requests for additional time to review and comment on the Draft MM EIS, DNSC informally extended the timeframe for submitting comments from July 18, 2003 (as stated in the *Federal Register* notice), to September 2, 2003. DNSC continued to address late comments to the extent practicable in preparing the Final MM EIS.

PP-4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – NEW HAVEN DEPOT

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor questioned how many New Haven residents cared enough about the proposed consolidated mercury storage at the New Haven Depot to provide comments.

DNSC RESPONSE: Approximately 140 people submitted registration forms for the public meeting in New Haven, Indiana, on the Draft MM EIS; a substantial number of attendees did not submit forms. Sixty-five presented oral comments and approximately 40 written comments were received from the New Haven area. In addition, two petitions were circulated strongly opposing the consolidated storage of mercury at the New Haven Depot (see Table 2–2 of the Comment Response Document) that collected a total of 677 signatures. Not taking into account that some individuals provided multiple comments and/or may have signed the petition, approximately 782 people provided comments. The population of New Haven Depot City was estimated to be 12,406 in 2000. Assuming all the commentors reside within the city boundaries, this approximation represents 6 percent of the population provided comments.

PP-5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – PHONE CALL

ISSUE SUMMARY: Several commentors asked that someone at DNSC contact them.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC contacted these commentors as requested.

PP-6. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – NOTIFICATION

ISSUE SUMMARY: A tenant was concerned that they hadn't been notified of the possible mercury storage at the Utah Industrial Depot.

DNSC RESPONSE: Utah Industrial Depot's communication policies are beyond the scope of the MM EIS. DNSC is committed to communicating with the public to ensure that all affected communities have a full understanding of the proposed action and has provided numerous opportunities for the public to participate in decisions that may affect them. DNSC participated in several meetings in the Salt Lake and Tooele City area with state, local, and emergency management officials to provide an understanding of the site evaluation process and DNSC's mercury storage operations.

PN-1. PURPOSE, NEED, AND TIMING – DEPOT CLOSURE

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors were concerned that long-term storage of mercury at the existing depots is not consistent with plans to close the depots.

DNSC RESPONSE: In conjunction with selling off or disposing of most of its materials, DNSC is planning for closure of its depots by 2020 or earlier. Section 1.2.1 lists the projected closure dates of the DNSC storage depots and states that the decision on the future management of the mercury stockpile will consider, among other factors, the closure plans. Also noted is that the final decision on mercury management could require that one or more depots remain open.

PN-2. PURPOSE, NEED, AND TIMING – OTHER MERCURY

ISSUE SUMMARY: A few commentors asked where the DNSC mercury originated, why it had been acquired, and if DNSC planned to acquire or accept additional mercury. Other commentors were concerned about the United States importing mercury when more than enough is being recovered by recycling. Another commentor asked when mercury had last been sold from the stockpile.

DNSC RESPONSE: As described in Sections 1.1 and 2.1, DNSC stores approximately 4,890 tons (4,436 metric tons) of elemental mercury in the National Defense Stockpile. The materials in the National Defense Stockpile were acquired so that in times of national emergency the United States would not have to depend on foreign sources for strategic and critical materials. DNSC mercury was acquired from domestic sources, Canada, Chile, Italy, Japan, Mexico, and Spain. The mercury, which has been declared excess to defense needs, is 99.5 to 99.9 percent pure. Mercury of this quality is currently bought and sold in the open market for uses that include barometers, blood pressure monitors, electric switches, light bulbs, dental fillings, and medicines. As described in Section 1.2.2, DNSC sold a total of 50,342 flasks of mercury between 1979 and 1994 generating over 8.4 million dollars in revenue.

The MM EIS addresses management of DNSC mercury exclusively. DNSC is not now accepting or acquiring additional mercury from any source and has no authority or plans to accept or acquire additional mercury in the future. Expansion of the storage facility to handle other mercury and ownership of that material is beyond the scope of the MM EIS and this decision process. However, private companies are free to purchase mercury to fill their requirements.

DNSC does not have information about the number of companies that mine mercury. However, as discussed in Section 2.2.3.2, the leading producers of mercury in 2002 were Spain, Kyrgyzstan, and Algeria. Mercury is no longer mined in the United States, although small amounts are still produced as a byproduct of mining other metals.

PN-3. PURPOSE, NEED, AND TIMING – OUT OF SCOPE

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor suggested activities (i.e., resolution to stop mercury production in other countries) that DNSC should pursue.

DNSC RESPONSE: Such activities suggested are beyond the scope of the MM EIS or the purview of DNSC.

PN-4. PURPOSE, NEED, AND TIMING – SCHEDULE

ISSUE SUMMARY: A number of commentors questioned why DNSC is taking so long to complete the MM EIS and requested that the mercury be removed immediately from their communities. Other commentors asked when the EIS process would be complete and how long it would take to ship the mercury.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC is prohibited by the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) from removing mercury from the existing storage locations until the EIS process has been completed. The Final MM EIS is currently scheduled for publication in early 2004. The Record of Decision (ROD) can be published no earlier than 30 days after the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Notice of Availability for the Final MM EIS is published in the *Federal Register*. If the preferred alternative (consolidated storage) is selected, the ROD may or may not specify one of the candidate sites analyzed in the MM EIS. If one of the candidate sites is not specified, additional time would be needed to identify another storage location and, possibly, to prepare additional environmental documentation. Section 2.2.2 notes that DNSC anticipates it will require approximately one year to stage and move the mercury to a consolidated storage site.

RP-1. RELATED PROGRAMS/DOCUMENTS – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor asked that DNSC consider the attached documents.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC acknowledges the submission of documents for review and will include them in the MM EIS Administrative Record.

RE-1. RISK – ECOLOGICAL – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: Several commentors were concerned about the impacts of mercury management activities on ecological resources near the candidate sites.

DNSC RESPONSE: All mercury storage locations would have approved Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plans and Installation Spill Contingency Plans to ensure that the appropriate response to a spill is made. State and local emergency response teams would be aware of the mercury storage.

As described in Chapter 4 and summarized in Section 2.5, there would be negligible ecological risk from mercury management activities during normal operations. In the event of a facility accident, airborne transport could result in negligible-to-moderate risks to plants and animals. Moderate risks would result

from wet deposition. However, wet deposition could occur only during a rain, making such an event unlikely.

The likelihood that a traffic accident would occur near the mercury storage site is low. Risks to plants and animals from transporting mercury under the Consolidated Storage and Sales Alternatives are negligible to high for the entire route traveled. The moderate-to-high ecological risks would occur if an accident with fire occurred during a rain event, which is unlikely.

RE-2. RISK – ECOLOGICAL – NEW HAVEN DEPOT

ISSUE SUMMARY: A few commentors were concerned about the impacts of mercury management activities on ecological resources near the New Haven Depot, including wetlands and water bodies such as Ashley Lake.

DNSC RESPONSE: According to Section 3.2.6.1, Ashley Lake is approximately 0.5 mi (0.8 km) from the New Haven Depot, and there are several wetlands in the vicinity. The lack of water flow from the depot to Ashley Lake and the wetlands would provide some protection of the ecosystem in the unlikely event of a spill. Mercury in dry soil can be cleaned up more readily than mercury in a stream, lake, or wetland, and it takes a long time for elemental mercury in dry soil to be transformed into more toxic forms. The New Haven Depot has an approved Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan and Installation Spill Contingency Plan to ensure that the appropriate response to a spill is made. State and local emergency response teams are aware of the mercury storage.

As described in Section 4.3.4 and summarized in Section 2.5.1.4, there would be negligible ecological risk from mercury management activities during normal operations. Section 4.3.5 states that in the event of an accident, airborne transport could result in negligible-to-moderate risks to plants and animals. Moderate risks would result from wet deposition. However, wet deposition could occur only during a rain, making such an event unlikely. Section 4.3.6 evaluates scenarios for truck and rail transportation accidents. The likelihood that a traffic accident would occur near the New Haven Depot is low. Risks to plants and animals from transporting mercury under the Consolidated Storage and Sales Alternatives are negligible to high for the entire route traveled. The moderate-to-high ecological risks would occur if the accident with fire occurred during a rain event, which is unlikely.

RA-1. RISK – HUMAN HEALTH – ACCIDENTS – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: Many commentors were concerned about the potential for adverse environmental and human health effects of accidents caused by natural disasters or human error. They referred to small spills and leaks of mercury and larger releases due to fire or natural disasters (e.g., tornados and earthquakes). Some were particularly concerned about the proximity of the storage facilities to populated areas. Some commentors were concerned that adequate emergency response capability is not available to respond to an accident involving mercury.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC has safely stored mercury for more than 50 years and has taken additional precautions to ensure that it continues to be stored safely over the next 40 years by overpacking the mercury in steel drums and making modifications to the storage buildings. This experience and these protective measures make it likely that normal (incident-free) operations would continue at the storage facilities. As discussed in Section 4.2.1.5, there have not been any spills of mercury resulting in environmental contamination over the decades in which the mercury stockpile has been maintained.

The *Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Report for the Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement* was performed to support the MM EIS (DLA 2004). This risk assessment was

performed using exposure limits and risk assessment guidance published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and other recognized Federal agencies and health organizations. The results of this risk assessment are included in the MM EIS. As described in Chapter 4 and summarized in Section 2.5 of the MM EIS, risks to the public from mercury released during facility accidents would be negligible to low at any of the candidate sites for all the alternatives considered. Mercury vapors that might escape from the storage facility after an accident would be diluted to low concentrations before reaching the public. This includes mercury that could be released during natural disasters such as earthquakes and tornadoes, and human-initiated spills, leaks, and other events such as aircraft crashes. Further, DNSC has prepared a risk analysis of a deliberate aircraft crash and conducted vulnerability assessments to ensure that the mercury storage depots remain safe and secure. These internal reports, which indicate that the mercury stockpile is not a likely target for terrorists, are not available to the public for security reasons.

Populations residing near the candidate sites are unlikely to face a major public health threat. This is because the risks are already negligible to low for an individual member of the public under the worst conditions that can reasonably be expected, and thus the risks for the general public would be even lower. As discussed in Section 4.2.1.5, the frequency (hence the risk) of an aircraft crash resulting in a release of mercury would be negligible for any of the current and proposed mercury storage locations.

As described in the Chapter 4 water resources subsections, plans are in place should a leak or spill occur. The mercury storage sites have approved Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plans and Installation Spill Contingency Plans to ensure that the appropriate response to a spill is made. DNSC maintains equipment and trains the workforce at its mercury storage locations to respond to mercury spills. State and local emergency response teams are aware of the mercury storage. Should there be a mercury spill, it would be cleaned up to applicable standards.

RA-2. RISK – HUMAN HEALTH – ACCIDENTS – TERRORIST

ISSUE SUMMARY: Many commentors were concerned about the potential for adverse human health effects of sabotage of the mercury storage facilities. Some commentors referred to attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, as support for their concerns.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC provides armed security, perimeter fencing, and closely controlled access at the existing storage depots. DNSC also works with local authorities to ensure that even the most unlikely scenarios would be handled properly. DNSC has prepared a risk analysis of a deliberate aircraft crash and conducted vulnerability assessments to ensure that the mercury storage depots remain safe and secure. These internal reports, which indicate that the mercury stockpile is not a likely target for terrorists, are not available to the public for security reasons. Comparable security measures would be implemented at a new storage location.

RA-3. RISK – HUMAN HEALTH – ACCIDENTS – TORNADO

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor was concerned about a tornado picking up the mercury flasks and dropping them on his house.

DNSC RESPONSE: A violent tornado (F4 or F5 on the Fujita Tornado Damage Scale) has wind speeds between 207 and 318 mph (333 to 512 km/hr). Less than 2 percent of all tornados are violent tornados. A tornado of this magnitude would likely demolish most wood frame structures in its path.

According to recent work by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Severe Storms Laboratory, the probability of a violent tornado hitting within 25 mi (40 km) of the New Haven Depot and the Warren Depot, is 5.5×10^{-4}/yr and 2.7×10^{-4}/yr, respectively. The probability of a violent tornado hitting

within 25 mi (40 km) of the Somerville Depot, U.S. Department of Energy's Y–12 site, Hawthorne Army Depot, PEZ Lake Development, and Utah Industrial Depot, is 1.4×10^{-4}/yr or approximately once in 10,000 years. The probability of a violent tornado hitting a particular spot within the 25-mi (40-km) area is even lower. Therefore, the probability that a violent tornado would hit the mercury storage building is low.

Section 4.2.1.5 describes the human health risk from facility accidents such as earthquakes and tornados. Risk to workers in the immediate vicinity of the spill would be low. Risk to the public outside the mercury storage building would be negligible.

RN-1. RISK – HUMAN HEALTH – NORMAL OPERATIONS – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: Many commentors expressed concerns about risks to public health and safety from storing the mercury, while others thought that the mercury is safely stored. Some commentors were concerned about the risk of cancer from exposure to mercury.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC has safely stored mercury for more than 50 years. As discussed in Section 4.2.1.5, no mercury has reportedly escaped from any of the mercury storage buildings, and there is no known member of the public that has been affected at any of the existing storage locations. Because mercury is a hazardous material, DNSC imposes strict controls to prevent exposure or release to the environment or to personnel working in the storage locations. DNSC would maintain the mercury storage buildings in compliance with applicable environmental, safety, and health requirements.

The *Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Report for the Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement* was performed to support the MM EIS (DLA 2004). This risk assessment was performed using exposure limits and risk assessment guidance published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and other recognized Federal agencies and health organizations. EPA has concluded that available data does not support classification of elemental mercury as a human carcinogen, meaning that mercury probably does not cause cancer.

The results of this risk assessment are included in the MM EIS. As described in Chapter 4 and summarized in Section 2.5 of the MM EIS, risks to the general public from normal operations would be negligible at any of the candidate sites for all the alternatives considered.

RN-2. RISK – HUMAN HEALTH – NORMAL OPERATIONS – CUMULATIVE

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors were concerned about the cumulative impacts of mercury management activities when added to other activities occurring near the candidate sites.

DNSC RESPONSE: Table ES–4 presents a summary of cumulative impacts for potential mercury management locations. Cumulative impacts analysis evaluates the potential effect of an action when combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal), private industry, or individual undertakes such other actions. As indicated in Table ES–4, increased development around the Somerville Depot and Utah Industrial Depot could result in moderate impacts to air quality, transportation infrastructure, employment, site infrastructure, and land use. Redevelopment of the PEZ Lake Development and Utah Industrial Depot could result in moderate impacts to transportation infrastructure, employment, site infrastructure, and land use. Cumulative impacts related to human health risk from normal operations would be negligible at all candidate sites.

Section 4.7.3.7.3 describes estimated cumulative impacts that include consideration of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions occurring near the Utah Industrial Depot. There is no evidence

of significant emissions of mercury or other similar hazardous compounds near the depot, and therefore there is no indication of cumulative human health effects that would be impacted by mercury storage.

RN-3. RISK – HUMAN HEALTH – NORMAL OPERATIONS – SENSITIVE INDIVIDUALS

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor was concerned that mercury exposure to sensitive individuals was not accounted for.

DNSC RESPONSE: Section 1.1.1 of the *Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Report for the Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement* (DLA 2004) states that the reference dose (RfD) and reference concentrations (RfC) used in estimating human health risk from long-term exposure to mercury include consideration of sensitive subgroups. Likewise the Emergency Response Planning Guideline (ERPG-2) used in estimating human health risk from short-term exposure resulting from an accident, is believed to be protective of all except a few hyper-susceptible members of the population.

RT-1. RISK – TRANSPORTATION – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: Several commentors were concerned about the potential for adverse environmental and human health effects of transporting the mercury stockpile, including vehicle accidents.

DNSC RESPONSE: Mercury has been transported as a common industrial commodity for many years. DNSC mercury in storage is currently overpacked at all locations except the U.S. Department of Energy's Y–12 site. No decision regarding transportation of mercury at Y–12, including whether it would be overpacked prior to shipment, has been made.

Transportation of mercury would be in accordance with the U.S. Department of Transportation hazardous material shipping requirements for using commercial truck and rail routes. DNSC would comply with any requirements for notification of state and local officials and emergency response personnel. In order to reduce the risk of terrorist activities, DNSC has not identified specific transportation routes.

Section 4.3.1 lists the numbers of truck or rail shipments that would be needed to move the mercury to the consolidated storage sites. Section 2.2.2 notes that it would take approximately one year to stage and move the mercury.

Sections 4.4.1 and 4.5.1.1 list the numbers of truck or rail shipments that would be needed to transport the mercury under the Sales Alternative. Section 4.4.1 states that for the Sale of Mercury at the Maximum Allowable Market Rate Alternative, the truck or rail trips would be expected to occur over a period of 26 years. Section 4.5.1.1 states that for the Sale of Mercury to Reduce Mercury Mining Alternative, the truck or rail trips would be expected to occur over a period of a few months.

The *Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Report for the Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement* (DLA 2004) evaluates the potential consequences of truck and rail transportation for both the Consolidated Storage and Sales Alternatives. The results of the transportation risk assessment are presented in Chapter 4 and summarized in Section 2.5 of the MM EIS.

Risk is a function of both frequency and consequence, and the more miles traveled, the greater the opportunity for an accident to occur. However, the length of the trip does not affect the risk of an accident occurring at any given location, rather, it affects the chance that an accident will occur somewhere along the overall route. Thus, although a longer trip increases the risk of an accident, the risk is the same at any given location.

The greatest risk to the public would result from a truck transportation accident resulting in a mercury spill and fire under the Sales Alternative. This risk would be moderate if it were raining when the accident occurred. For the Consolidated Storage Alternative, risk from this accident would be low if the accident occurred while it was raining. The risk of a mechanically induced fatality occurring somewhere along the route would be moderate for the Sales Alternative and low for the Consolidated Storage Alternative.

Ecological risks resulting from this postulated accident range from negligible to high, depending on the receptor organism and the weather. High ecological risk would result under the Sales Alternative for certain ecological receptors, but only if it were raining at the time of the accident. Moderate ecological risk would result for certain ecological receptors under the Consolidated Storage Alternative. However, the probability that a fire would occur while it is raining and the limited area involved suggests that the ecological risks of transportation accidents are likely to be lower than estimated.

RT-2. RISK – TRANSPORTATION – SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor suggested that mercury shipping containers should be subject to the same kind of rigorous testing as containers for spent nuclear fuel.

DNSC RESPONSE: Shipping of highly radioactive spent nuclear fuel is subject to much stricter standards than the shipping of industrial commodities such as mercury.

RT-3. RISK – TRANSPORTATION – WALKER RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION

ISSUE SUMMARY: The Walker River Paiute Tribe is concerned about the transportation of mercury via rail or truck across the Walker River Indian Reservation.

DNSC RESPONSE: As discussed in Section 2.3, DNSC's preferred alternative is consolidated storage at one location. However, no decision will be made until after the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Notice of Availability for the Final MM EIS is published in the *Federal Register*. Decisions on mercury management will be based on the environmental analyses presented in the MM EIS, including health and safety, security and socioeconomics. Other factors such as cost, strategic considerations, and public input, including consultations with potentially affected Native American tribal governments will also be considered. As indicated in Section 5.3.3, the consultation process may include government-to-government meetings, interviews, and site visits, as appropriate. DNSC will announce its decisions and approach to management of the excess mercury stockpile in the Record of Decision, which will be published no earlier than 30 days after publication of the Final MM EIS Notice of Availability.

Section 4.3.6 evaluates reasonable scenarios for truck and rail transportation accidents. The likelihood that a traffic accident would occur on the Reservation is low. Risks to human health from transporting mercury to the Hawthorne Army Depot under the Consolidated Storage Alternative are negligible to low for the entire 770,816 mi (1,240,505 km) of roadway or 414,849 mi (667,633 km) of railway traveled. Risks to plants and animals would be negligible to moderate for the entire route traveled. The moderate ecological risks would occur if the accident with fire occurred during a rain event, which is unlikely in a dry climate. The portions of the truck and rail routes crossing the Reservation amount to approximately 9,240 mi (14,870 km) and 5,616 mi (9,038 km), respectively, or approximately 1 percent of the total distance traveled. Therefore, the limited probability that an accident with fire would occur while it is raining, the relatively short transportation distances across the Reservation, and the negligible risk from spills without a fire, suggests that the risks from transportation accidents are likely to be lower than that estimated in the MM EIS.

SE-1. SOCIOECONOMICS – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors were concerned that socioeconomic impacts were not evaluated.

DNSC RESPONSE: Existing socioeconomic conditions at the candidate sites are described in Chapter 3. Socioeconomic impacts were analyzed for each of the alternatives as described in Chapter 4 and summarized in Section 2.5.1.3. Results indicate that the alternatives would likely have negligible socioeconomic impacts at the potentially affected sites, except for the Sale of Mercury to Reduce Mercury Mining Alternative that could have moderate impacts near the mercury mine and refinery from reduced employment.

SE-2. SOCIOECONOMICS – PROPERTY VALUES AND DEVELOPMENT

ISSUE SUMMARY: A number of commentors were concerned about impacts on property values due to a negative perception of mercury storage. Others were concerned about discouraging more desirable development in the region. Some commentors were concerned about their community being labeled a "dumping ground" for wastes and other hazardous materials.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC has worked with the public throughout the EIS process to help them understand the potential risks presented by the mercury management alternatives so that opinions can be formulated based on facts and not perception. DNSC has safely stored mercury for more than 50 years and has taken additional precautions to ensure that it continues to be stored safely over the next 40 years by overpacking the mercury in steel drums and making modifications to the storage buildings. Sections 1.2.3 and 2.2.1 describe mercury storage at the existing locations. Potential human health risks from normal operations and facility accidents at each of the candidate sites are described in Sections 4.3.4 and 4.3.5 and summarized in Sections 2.5.1.4 and 2.5.1.5. The analyses indicate that there is negligible-to-low risk to the general public associated with consolidated mercury storage at any of the candidate sites. As noted in Chapter 4, there would be no new construction, as existing warehouses would be used for consolidated storage so there would be no physical evidence that operations have changed.

SB-1. STORAGE BUILDING DESIGN AND OPERATION – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors expressed concern that the storage buildings are not appropriate for mercury storage. Some questioned the mercury packaging and leak containment provisions, while others questioned whether the buildings are secure. However, some commentors believe that the mercury is safely stored.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC has safely stored mercury for more than 50 years and has taken additional precautions to ensure that it continues to be stored safely over the next 40 years by overpacking the mercury in steel drums and making modifications to the storage buildings. As described in Section 2.2.1, mercury at the DNSC depots is stored in 76-lb (34-kg) capacity flasks sealed in airtight 30-gal (114-l) drums. The flasks are separated by dividers inside the drums and rest on an absorbent mat that doubles as cushioning material. Flasks are enclosed in plastic bags and sealed with wire ties. Drum lids have half-inch rubber gaskets, and a steel locking ring is bolted in place to seal the drum lid. The drums rest on catch trays on wooden pallets on sealed floors. As described in Section 4.2.1.5, the catch trays can contain the contents of several flasks. Floor curbing was recently installed in the mercury storage buildings at the New Haven, Somerville and Warren depots. Therefore, leakage of mercury in an amount sufficient to escape the warehouse is unlikely. Should an emergency occur, the mercury storage sites would have approved Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plans and Installation Spill Contingency Plans to ensure that the appropriate response is made.

As described in Section 2.2.4, periodic inspections would ensure that mercury storage containers are in good condition and leak free. Any defects in the packaging would be quickly corrected. Inspections would be conducted by appropriately trained DNSC or contract personnel.

Warehouses would be kept locked except for inspections and other periodic maintenance work. In addition to security, perimeter fencing, and closely controlled access, DNSC would work with local authorities to ensure that even the most unlikely scenarios would be handled properly.

DNSC would require comparable levels of protection at any storage location. The costs of providing this protection could be a consideration in site selection should DNSC decide on consolidation at a single site.

SB-2. STORAGE BUILDING DESIGN AND OPERATION – TEMPERATURE

ISSUE SUMMARY: Several commentors were concerned about mercury vapors escaping the mercury storage containers due to elevated temperatures. One commentor suggested that mercury could not be stored in buildings where the temperature exceeds 70 °F (21 °C). A commentor asked if the mercury storage buildings would be air conditioned.

DNSC RESPONSE: The March 5, 2001, *Federal Register* Notice was prepared before the mercury storage flasks were placed in airtight 30-gal (114-l) drums (overpacked). In the event that a flask should leak, this airtight overpacking should prevent the release of mercury vapor to the environment at the range of temperatures expected within the warehouse. Periodic inspections, including mercury vapor sampling, would also ensure that mercury vapor would be detected, in the unlikely event that it should escape from the drums.

Although the temperature of the storage facilities will be considered when making the mercury management decision, it is no longer considered a requirement for mercury storage. Note that mercury boils at 674 °F (357 °C).

There are no plans to air condition mercury storage buildings.

SB-3. STORAGE BUILDING DESIGN AND OPERATION – LEAKS

ISSUE SUMMARY: Some commentors asked when leaks had occurred at the existing mercury storage locations.

DNSC RESPONSE: As described in Sections 3.2.4.2 and 3.4.4.2, the most recent leaks of mercury at the New Haven and Warren depots occurred in 2002 and 1998, respectively. The leaks occurred by seepage through failed welds of several flasks of an old design. There were no reportable releases nor environmental contamination as a result of these leaks. DNSC is not aware of any leaks at the Somerville Depot or at the U.S. Department of Energy's Y–12 site.

With completion of the overpacking project in 2002, mercury at the DNSC depots is now stored in 76-lb (34-kg) capacity flasks sealed in 30-gal (114-l) drums. The flasks are separated by dividers inside the drums and rest on an absorbent mat that doubles as cushioning material. Flasks are enclosed in plastic bags and sealed with wire ties. Drum lids have half-inch rubber gaskets, and a steel locking ring is bolted in place to seal the drum lid. The drums rest on catch trays on wooden pallets. As described in Section 4.2.1.5, the catch trays can contain the contents of several flasks.

SB-4. STORAGE BUILDING DESIGN AND OPERATION – LOGISTICS

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor was concerned about the logistics of DNSC managing mercury storage at remote locations.

DNSC RESPONSE: Monitoring and maintenance requirements are described in Section 2.2.4. As described in Section 1.2.1, DNSC currently manages the logistics associated with storage of 56 commodities at government and private industry properties nationwide. DNSC commonly and successfully manages materials at locations remote to its Headquarters in Fort Belvoir, Virginia, or staffed depots. Management and logistics will be considered in making the mercury management decision.

WM-1. WASTE MANAGEMENT – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: Many commentors suggested that the DNSC mercury is a hazardous waste.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC materials are industrial commodities that are being stored for future use; therefore, despite some hazardous properties, they are not wastes. DNSC mercury is not a waste but is a marketable material that is 99.5 to 99.9 percent pure. Mercury of this quality is currently bought and sold on the open market for uses such as thermometers, barometers, blood pressure monitors, switches, light bulbs, dental fillings, and medicines, among others. As described in Section 1.1, mercury is designated a hazardous substance under Section 307(a) of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), Section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), and 49 CFR 172.101 of the U.S. Department of Transportation hazardous materials regulations.

WR-1. WATER RESOURCES – GENERAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: Several commentors were concerned about the impacts of mercury management activities on surface water and groundwater resources including sources of drinking water.

DNSC RESPONSE: Potential impacts on water resources for the mercury management alternatives are described in Chapter 4 and summarized in Section 2.5.1.7. These analyses indicate a negligible risk to water resources from mercury storage because safeguards are in place to ensure that mercury spills or leaks do not reach soils or surfaces where they could be conveyed to surface waters or groundwater.

As described in Section 2.2.1, mercury at the DNSC depots is stored in 76-lb (34-kg) capacity flasks sealed in airtight 30-gal (114-l) drums. The flasks are separated by dividers inside the drums and rest on an absorbent mat that doubles as cushioning material. Flasks are enclosed in plastic bags and sealed with wire ties. Drum lids have half-inch rubber gaskets, and a steel locking ring is bolted in place to seal the drum lid. The drums rest on catch trays on wooden pallets on sealed floors. As described in Section 4.2.1.5, the catch trays can contain the contents of several flasks. Floor curbing was recently installed in the mercury storage buildings at the New Haven, Somerville and Warren depots. Therefore, leakage of mercury in an amount sufficient to escape the warehouse is unlikely. Should an emergency occur, the mercury storage sites have approved Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plans and Installation Spill Contingency Plans to ensure that the appropriate response is made.

WR-2. WATER RESOURCES – APPROVAL

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor noted that formal approval by the Indiana Department of Natural Resource's Division of Water is not required.

DNSC RESPONSE: DNSC appreciates the Indiana Department of Natural Resource's review of mercury management alternatives proposed for the New Haven Depot.

WR-3. WATER RESOURCES – UTAH INDUSTRIAL DEPOT

ISSUE SUMMARY: A commentor was concerned that impacts to the aquifer beneath the Utah Industrial Depot had not been considered.

DNSC RESPONSE: The MM EIS analysis of water resources encompassed the Tooele Valley and adjacent areas that serve as points of recharge to the basin-fill aquifers underlying the valley. As stated in Section 3.8.6.2, the Tooele Valley contains one of the principal basin-fill aquifers in Utah. The direction of groundwater flow within this aquifer and beneath the Tooele Valley is generally northward toward discharge areas about 6 mi (9.6 km) north of the Utah Industrial Depot along the margin of the Great Salt Lake. Water levels in supply wells for the Tooele Army Depot and the Utah Industrial Depot range from about 200 ft (61 m) to over 700 ft (213 m) below the ground surface.

2.4 REFERENCES

CEC (Commission of the European Communities), 2002, *Report from the Commission to the Council Concerning Mercury from the Chlor-Alkali Industry*, Brussels, June 9.

DLA (Defense Logistics Agency), 2004, *Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Report for the Mercury Management Environmental Impact Statement*, Defense National Stockpile Center, Fort Belvoir, VA.