

Tom Nachtrab
10530 Larwin Avenue unit 7
Chatsworth, CA 91311
tnachtrab@gmail.com

March 1, 2017

Ms. Stephanie Jennings
NEPA Document Manager, SSFL, Area IV EIS
U. S. Department of Energy
4100 Guardian Street
Simi Valley, CA 93063

Comments on: *Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Remediation of Area IV and the Northern Buffer Zone of the Santa Susana Field Laboratory (Draft SSFL Area IV EIS) (DOE/EIS-0402)*

Dear Ms. Jennings,

I submit the following comments on the Draft Area IV EIS as a community stakeholder, living approximately four miles from the former Santa Susana Field Laboratory. Although I am a director of the Santa Susana Mountain Park Association and a member of the SSFL Community Advisory Group, the statements below are my personal comments and do not represent any organization.

Quality of the Draft Area IV EIS document:

I commend the preparers of the DEIS for the high quality of the document itself. It is a well-written document: carefully worded, well-organized, and competently reasoned. The document is a straightforwardly understandable and discussible platform for community consideration of the many complex issues entailed by the remediation of Area IV.

Presentation of multiple alternatives for soil remediation:

It is satisfying to see that DOE's EIS is faithful to the intent of both NEPA and CEQA laws by defining and evaluating reasonable soil remediation alternatives in addition to the "No Action" and "AOC Look-Up Table Values" alternatives. The EIS is correct to put forward two additional alternatives that also strive to safeguard the health of humans, wildlife and the environment. Drawing the distinction between a "Proposed Action" (AOC Cleanup) and a "Preferred Alternative" (yet to be decided) aids the public in comprehending and discussing the complex situation of remediation of Area IV.

I support "Conservation of Natural Resources" as Preferred Alternative for Soil Remediation:

The soils of Area IV must be cleaned up. "No Action" is not a responsible alternative. Likewise, the "AOC Look-Up Table Values" alternative must be ruled out because it presents unresolvable technical dilemmas, runs the risk of redistributing contaminants through transport activities, and entails excessive truck traffic through surrounding communities. The health risk projection for the "Conservation of Natural Resources" alternative falls within the USEPA acceptable target cancer risk range. The "Conservation of Natural Resources" alternative thereby protects human health, and does so at less cost and in less time than other alternatives. The "Conservation of Natural Resources" alternative balances multiple complex variables and is the best real-world choice for "Preferred Alternative."

Sincerely,



Tom Nachtrab