



webserver@yucca-web.ymp.gov on 01/09/2008 12:03:42 PM

RRR000931

To: EIS_Comments@ymp.gov
cc:
Subject: EIS Comment

User Filed as: Not Categorized in ERMS

January 09, 2008 12:03:42

IP address: 207.106.147.2

The Commentors Name:

---> nora nash

The Commentors Address:

---> 609 S. Convent Road
---> Aston, Pennsylvania 19014

Email Information:

---> nnash@osfphila.org
---> Add commentor to the mailing list : null

Contact Information:

---> fax number :
---> phone number : 610 558 7661
---> organization : Sisters of St. Francis
---> position :

Comment Text :

--->

1 [1. DOE should extend the public comment period by 60 additional days, given the extensive volume of environmental impact documents. In order to give meaningful comments, the public needs the added time for proper understanding of the proposals, analyses and references, and to compare and contrast them with the even more extensive volume EIS published by DOE in 2002.]

2 [2. Shipping tens of thousands of high-level radioactive waste trucks, trains, and barges through 45 states and the District of Columbia risks severe accidents and terrorist attacks. This opens the possibility of a release of catastrophic amounts of deadly radioactivity in major population centers. The proposed waste transports are potential Mobile Chernobyls and dirty bombs on wheels rolling past the homes of millions of U.S. residents. Each truck cask of irradiated nuclear fuel would contain 350,000 curies of radioactive cesium and strontium, or about 20 to 30 times the amount of these harmful fission products released by the Hiroshima atomic bomb. Every dedicated train hauling three or four rail casks would contain more radioactive cesium-137 than the total amount released during the Chernobyl nuclear catastrophe. DOE must integrate into its Yucca Mountain transport analysis its own proposals, under the Bush

administration's "Global Nuclear Energy Partnership" (GNEP), for waste imports from overseas and waste shipments to reprocessing (plutonium extraction) centers in the U.S. before waste shipments to Yucca for final disposal. DOE must also analyze the increased transport risks from its proposal to nearly double the amount of waste to be buried at Yucca to 130,000 metric tons - which on its face violates the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended, which limits the amount of waste that could be buried at the first repository to 70,000 metric tons, at least until a second repository is opened in another state.

3 [3. DOE proposed the equivalent of the TAD (Transport, Aging, and Disposal) canisters in the early to mid-1990s, only back then it was called MPC (multi-purpose canisters). DOE needs to completely explain why it is attempting to revive an idea it had dismissed as unworkable over a decade ago. DOE needs to fully explain the increased risks to workers and the public at and near the nuclear reactors across the U.S. where TADs would be loaded and permanently sealed. Those risks now have been shifted largely to the reactor sites, away from Yucca where they previously were proposed to be. How will waste handling errors at reactors, especially involving defective TADs and damaged irradiated nuclear fuel, worsen transport risks and radioactivity releases at Yucca over time? DOE also must explain the disconnect between its GNEP proposal to reprocess wastes and its current Yucca proposal to permanently seal shut wastes at reactors in TAD containers.

4. DOE has selected four companies to design the TAD canisters, including Holtec International. But a whistleblower from the largest U.S. nuclear utility has alleged and extensively documented since 2000 that Holtec's waste storage/transport containers violate federal quality assurance (QA) regulations. This calls into question the containers' structural integrity, especially under transport accident conditions. This industry whistleblower's testimony is reinforced by a retired U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission safety engineer and dry cask storage expert. How can DOE give such a contract to a company that violates QA, especially after DOE's own extensive QA violations at the Yucca Mountain Project?

As investors in these kinds of corporations. We know from past experience, dating back to 1980, that DOE contracts are not written with the environmental impact or community impact in the forefront. Corporations, often, are not paid to do anything more than public relations on these issues. We are witnessing the same sort of lax oversight by the DOD and other federal agencies on the private military corporations. We urge strong attention to the contract language and specific staff, division accountability and sufficient budget to do the proper oversight.]

4 [5. All of the land at the Yucca Mountain dump project is within the treaty lands of the Western Shoshone Indian Nation, as affirmed by the "Peace and Friendship" Treaty of Ruby Valley, signed by the U.S. government in 1863. Treaties are declared by the U.S. Constitution to be the supreme law of the land, equal in stature to the Constitution itself. The Western Shoshone Nation opposes radioactive waste dumping at its sacred Yucca Mountain, where traditional ceremonies have continued to be conducted right up to recent years.

For this reason alone, DOE should terminate the Yucca Mountain Project. The

United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination ruled in recent years that the Yucca Mountain Project represents a human rights violation against the indigenous Western Shoshone Nation and has urged the U.S.

government to cease and desist activities there. The Yucca Mountain dump proposal represents blatant environmental racism, as stated by Ian Zabarte of the Western Shoshone National Council at DOE's recent Las Vegas and Washington, D.C. hearings.]

5 [6. How can DOE propose "aging pads" at Yucca Mountain, when the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended, prohibits an interim monitored retrievable storage site co-located in the same state as the repository? DOE's proposal is actually illegal, in that it attempts to place all of the burdens (both interim storage and permanent disposal) on one state. DOE needs to fully analyze the earthquake risks at its proposed interim storage site at Yucca, especially considering the earthquake fault line recently discovered directly under DOE's original "aging" pad location.]

6 [7. A federal judge, ruling against DOE and in favor of the State of Nevada over DOE's illegal use of water at the Yucca Mountain Project, recently concluded that DOE either is engaged in "busy work" at the site (wasting water and Nuclear Waste Fund monies), or DOE misled Congress and the President in 2002 that site characterization had concluded at the site when DOE announced the site suitable for a high-level radioactive waste dump. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended, required DOE to apply for its license application on Oct. 23, 2002, assuming that DOE's site suitability determination would mean that DOE must be extremely close to ready to submit a complete license application. Yet, over five years later, DOE still has not submitted its license application. DOE has known for over a decade that rainwater percolates relatively quickly through the proposed burial site and risks fast corrosion of the waste containers that would be buried there. In fact, DOE did away with its own Site Suitability Guidelines that would have disqualified the site from any further consideration, specifically for this reason, just before declaring the site suitable. DOE should admit to Congress and the President that the site, in fact, is not suitable and begin to conduct a sound scientific search for suitable geology that can isolate radioactive waste from the living environment for a million years. DOE must halt the rush to submit its incomplete licensing application by its self-imposed June 30, 2008 deadline. This is an obvious politically based decision to initiate the Yucca licensing proceeding before the pro-Yucca dump Bush administration leaves office.]
