

47 Star Vista Rd.
Santa Fe, NM 87505
November 16, 2007

Mr. John E. Kieling, Program Manager
Hazardous Waste Bureau – New Mexico Environment Department
2905 Rodeo Park Drive East, Building 1
Santa Fe, NM 87505-6303

Re: LANL Remedy Selection for MDA-H

Mr. Keiling:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed corrective action at LANL MDA-H area. My home is in Santa Fe, down stream from LANL, I use the Rio Grande adjacent to and down stream from LANL, and I use the lands around LANL. My family and I have concerns regarding contaminants potentially emanating from LANL.

It is difficult to read the “fact sheet” without being cynical. The take home message seems to be, “it’s OK to line a pit with concrete and dump aluminum, barium, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, copper, lithium, steel, lead, mercury, silver, tungsten, high explosives, plutonium, tritium, uranium, graphite, paper, plastics, toluene, etc. into it, cover it up, and forget about it”. Is that correct, can I really do that? If it isn’t OK for me, why would it be all right for LANL to do it on a massive scale?

LANL has existed for about 60 years but they assure us they will keep track of these hazardous contaminants for the next 100 years, and that their proposed treatment (i.e., partial concrete lining) and NMED’s preferred treatment (complete concrete lining) will work just fine for the next 1,000 years while the uranium decomposes. Are these the same folks that said their contaminants wouldn’t reach the regional aquifer for 10,000 years? As you know, they have already contaminated the regional aquifer, about 9,950 years ahead of schedule. Do you really think the proposed concrete lining (Alt. 3a or 3b) will work for 1,000 years? Will LANL actually be in existence for another 100 years to monitor the problem? Will the concrete/grout persist intact that long in contact with acids from plants? Will there be any seismic problems in the area during the next 1,000 years that might effect the grout? Does the magma that is currently moving deep under the caldera adjacent to LANL have any implications?

These toxic substances were dumped by people who were supposedly our foremost scientists. They certainly knew the properties of the substances when they dumped them, and knew they were toxic and dangerous. Possibly some of the same people that dumped these toxins were the same brilliant, stupid LANL idiots that pushed Project Chariot in

the 1950s, the proposed near surface nuclear explosions near Point Hope, Alaska (see The Firecracker Boys 1995 by Dan O'Neil; ISBN 10-0312134169).

LANL made this mess - they need to clean it up. Obviously the only real solution is Alternative 4 (removal and off site disposal): dig it up, handle it properly, and dispose of it where it won't be a threat to the future. LANL and the surrounding area are not suitable for disposal of hazardous waste. Geologically the area is a very poor location for toxic waste storage; there is a proven connection from the surface to the regional aquifer.

The engineering and analysis for Alternative 4 smells strongly of trying to justify the quick, dirty, cheap, and inadequate Alternatives # 1, 2 and 3. For example, their design for Alternative #4 proposes to trench, with a 1.5 to 1 slope, along all the holes. This approach seems to pointlessly moves a huge amount of extra material. Why not use a remote clamshell to excavate only the dumped material in each hole? Their analysis needs review by a non-biased outside engineering firm.

NMED needs to stand up for the people of New Mexico and see that this mess is cleaned up correctly. Out of site, is not out of mind, and does not solve the problem!

I look forward to hearing from you,

Jon Klingel