

**PUBLIC COMMENT**  
**CLEAN UP PLAN FOR**  
**WASTE AREA GROUP 3**  
**(IDAHO CHEMICAL PROCESSING PLANT)**

**INEEL**

**DECEMBER 22, 1998**

**COMMENTS BY:**

**Margaret Macdonald Stewart**  
**PO Box 2404**  
**Ketchum, Id 83340**

These comments will be brief and to the point. As a member of the focus group that helped INEEL devise a "publically readable" document, I must recognize the time and effort that has gone into this document. It is indeed readable, "user friendly", and visually, the best WAG Cleanup Plan I've yet seen. However, the contents of the cleanup plan leave me with feelings of uncertainty, of reading a plan published in a hurry without enough solid science and technology to back up the plan, and without a clear definition of what cleanup really means.

My greatest concern is that the Department of Energy's definition of clean is a far cry from what the general public would determine as clean. To "implode" a contaminated building above contaminated soil, and then cap it and call it clean is what most people would call a "cover up." The exact amount of contamination that was there before the implosion process began, will be there when the cap and cover job is done. We will be left with the same amount of contamination threatchning the underlying aquifer (Idaho's lifeblood- and don't ever forget that, PLEASE) as we have now. Granted, the half-life process of decay will blessedly take away some of that contamination, but there will remain a great deal of threat to our aquifer.

It seems amazing to me that the public is being asked to comment on the waste dump area when we don't even know what the waste acceptance criteria is.

I could go on and on but I think the entire clean up plan reeks of "cart before the horse". We have a clean up plan but the clean up plan doesn't appear to be very technically thought out. Better luck on the next, more precise try!

Sincerely,  
Margaret Macdonald Stewart

