

U102d100d
mail

0075498

Elzie, Teri L

From: Tom_OBrien@r1.fws.gov
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 12:01 PM
To: Hanford_Trustees%FWS@r1.fws.gov
Subject: Nuclear Waste Cleanup Proposal for DOE sites



Adobe Portable Document

fyi

----- Forwarded by Tom OBrien/RO/R1/FWS/DOI on 03/29/2001 11:57 AM -----

Craig R Moore
03/27/2001 01:50 PM
To: Mary Henry/ARL/R9/FWS/DOI@FWS
cc: Don Steffek/RO/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS, Tom OBrien/RO/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS, Allen Robison/R4/FWS/DOI@FWS
Subject: Nuclear Waste Cleanup Proposal for DOE sites

RECEIVED
JAN 15 2008
EDMC

Mary, Don, Tom, Allen

Thought you guys should see this ASAP too! Just in case you haven't heard about it already.

Gee, I only see one small flaw with this plan. It make the basic assumption that wildlife doesn't need clean / safe habitat to survive the way humans do!

Craig

----- Forwarded by Craig R Moore/ARL/R9/FWS/DOI on 03/27/01 04:51 PM -----

Linda Lyon
03/27/01 03:26 PM
To: Billy Umsted/R9/FWS/DOI@FWS, Everett Wilson/ARL/R9/FWS/DOI@FWS, Craig R Moore/ARL/R9/FWS/DOI@FWS, Elizabeth Souheaver/NWRS/R9/FWS/DOI@FWS, Barbara Wyman/NWRS/R9/FWS/DOI@FWS
cc:
Subject: Nuclear Waste Cleanup Proposal for DOE sites

----- Forwarded by Linda Lyon/NWRS/R9/FWS/DOI on 03/27/01 03:31 PM -----

Kenneth McDermond
03/27/01 03:20 PM
To: Ralph Morgenweck/R6/FWS/DOI@FWS
cc: John Blankenship/R6/FWS/DOI@FWS, Dave Heffernan/R6/FWS/DOI@FWS, Linda Lyon/NWRS/R9/FWS/DOI@FWS, Dan Ashe/ARW/R9/FWS/DOI@FWS, Jim T Kurth/NWRS/R9/FWS/DOI@FWS, Larry R

Ralph,

The report referenced in this article is attached. I'll bring you a copy. The proposal has important implications for Service involvement at Rocky Flats and at many of the other DOE nuclear facilities. This is at the least a very interesting report and at the worst very troubling. I am interested in your perspective. I think we need to be prepared to react, as an agency/department to this proposal. Since Region 1 is actively involved with Hanford, you may want to pass on to Anne.

Thanks,
Ken

[Back to Today from InsideEPA.com]

Bush Advisor Urges Killing DOE Cleanup Program To Fund Tax Cut

A policy advisor to President Bush recommends that the administration could help pay for its \$1.6 trillion tax cut by eliminating the Department of Energy's (DOE) nuclear waste cleanup program and redesignating the contaminated sites as wildlife preserves.

A report by the advisor, titled *From Waste to Wilderness: Maintaining Biodiversity on Nuclear-Bomb-Building Sites*, argues that the \$6 billion spent each year on DOE's cleanup program is a waste of money and only represents a boon to local lawmakers in the form of jobs and subsidies. "The DOE nuclear-waste-management program is arguably the biggest boondoggle in all of current pork-barrel spending . . . The only losers would be government officials who administer the present cleanup program, short-sighted politicians, and local communities that desire pork-barrel 'nuclear welfare,'" the report says.

The report, to be released next month, is authored by Robert Nelson, an economist in the Interior Secretary's office from 1975 through 1993, and a member of Bush's environmental transition team. Nelson, a researcher at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, says his goal is to gain support for his plan amongst legislators and administration officials and have a hearing on his proposal.

The report is being released as DOE and administration officials face increasing criticism from lawmakers and environmentalists over a proposed cut to the department's environmental cleanup budget. These advocates argue that even flat funding levels would be insufficient to allow numerous waste sites, including the Hanford, WA site to meet legally-binding closure deadlines. Washington state officials are even preparing a lawsuit against DOE in anticipation of the agency falling behind schedule at Hanford.

Specifically, the report urges turning the five most-contaminated DOE sites -- Oak Ridge, TN, Savannah River, SC, Rocky Flats, CO, the Idaho National Environmental and Engineering Laboratory and Hanford -- into wildlife refuges, because they are responsible for over 70 percent of cleanup and containment costs. "Paradoxically, the presence of radiation danger and national security concerns have meant that these very same places offer some of the finest and least disturbed plant and animal habitats in the United States," the report says.

Source: InsideEPA.com

Date: March 26, 2001

© Inside Washington Publishers