

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE **PR 2,19,20 et al.**
(64FR8640)

DOCKETED
USPT

From: Doe Kelly <doekelly@juno.com>
To: TWFN_DO.twf4_po(CAG) '99 JUL -6 A7:51
Date: Thu, Jul 1, 1999 12:51 AM
Subject: RE: Proposed Rule - Disposal of High Level Radioactive Wastes at Yucca Mountain, Nevada

I would like to register my opinion on nuclear waste storage at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, as being in agreement with the objections listed below, in this email.....I will not go into further detail, in the interest of time, as my time to comment is nearly gone.

I am a US citizen, living in the state of Colorado. I agree that we need to stop this madness, as stated below!

Sincerely,

Doe Kelly
622 Barberry Dr.
Longmont, Co

Subject: 2 Radiation alerts!

Dear friends,

Two action alerts regarding the increase of radioactivity into the environment came my way from a friend and established investigative reporter so I am passing them on to you, to give you the opportunity to respond and tell our government NO! But one if the deadlines for public response is very soon, by tomorrow.

The first involves licensing Yucca Mountain, Nevada, where the Dept. of Energy and the nuclear industry want to house most of the nation's high-level nuclear waste. This is the irradiated fuel that comes out of the reactor core and remains deadly, basically forever. In order to get the high-level waste from the nation's nuclear power plants out to Yucca Mountain, the plan is to ship it in concrete casks on truck and trains going down public roads and rail lines. There are nuke plants in 43 states, and 50,000,000 people live within half a mile of the proposed shipping routes! Besides the insanity of that, Yucca Mountain is on Western Shoshone land, and for geological reasons it is one of the worst places to put such potent toxic waste. Already, it is known that the mountain is so leaky that there is no way it will be able to stop the radioactive poisons from leaching out into surrounding water tables and contaminating the communities nearby.

The NIRS Action Alert below contains more details on the issue as well as detailed instructions on how to file your comment by email or fax.

The second issue involves the release of radioactive metals onto the open market where they will be "recycled" into consumer goods. No, this isn't fiction. The metals used in the nations's nuclear weapons facilities and power plants become radioactive as these facilities operate. Now that many of them are shutting down, or being "decommissioned," we have an

Template = SECY-067

Acknowledged by card JUL - 8 1999

SECY-02

awful lot of this radioactive metal on our hands. So instead of trying to isolate it from the environment and from us, the government is allowing it to be melted down where it can then be made into pots and pans, silverware, zippers, batteries, cars, furniture -- anything that contains metal. I don't know about you, but I don't particularly want to be eating from radioactive spoons! Again, there is more information in the NIRS alert below.

Unfortunately, both issues need very quick responses -- radioactive recycling by JULY 5, and Yucca Mountain by JUNE 30. But, the greater response, the greater chance there is of stopping this madness -- for our generation and for those who come after us. Remember, it only took 275,000 comments from an outraged citizenry nationwide to get the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture to withdraw its proposed rules on organic food.

Joel

NIRS info.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN:

Tell the Nuclear Regulatory Commission "Don't Screw Nevada!"

Submit Your Comments on NRC Proposed Repository Licensing Rule for Yucca Mountain by June 30th

Comments are critical at this time. The NRC's Proposed Rule would weaken radiation protection standards for the public and the environment by usurping EPA's legally mandated jurisdiction (under the Energy Policy Act of 1992) to set the standards for the proposed Yucca Mountain repository. This would accommodate the DOE, which, in its impatience to move towards its recommendation to the President and its license application for the Yucca Mountain repository, is pressuring NRC to set standards soon, in advance of the EPA. This would also serve to lower the standards to such an extent that Yucca Mountain might still qualify to serve as the repository for the nation's high-level radioactive waste, despite Yucca Mountain's severe safety shortcomings. The NRC's proposed rule should be withdrawn until EPA promulgates standards, at which time NRC can then modify its repository licensing rule to meet the EPA standards, as required by law.

In order to make a bigger "splash" with the NRC, we are encouraging individuals and organizations to submit their own comments, rather than to simply sign on to NIRS' comments. This way, NRC will have to handle each individual entry as one more distinct public comment; the larger the number of such comments, the more clear it will be that citizens across the USA are concerned with the NRC and DOE forcing shortcuts on safety at Yucca Mountain.

The full text for the NRC proposed rule can be found in the 2/22/99 Federal Register (Vol. 64, Num. 34, starting at page 8639 -- the document is 78 pages long), which is accessible via internet at http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/aces/aces140.html This is the Federal Register Online via GPO Access. Click on the "Federal Register" button. Make sure the date is set for 1999, and on 2/22/99. Use "nuclear" as the search term, and click "submit". If you have problems, phone Kevin Kamps at NIRS (ph. 202-328-0002), or the GPO Access User Support Team (ph. 202-512-1530)

NIRS will post its comments on the NIRS website (www.nirs.org) on Monday afternoon, June 28th. Please feel free at that time to "borrow" ideas, to formulate comments in your own words.

In the meantime, the following points give an overview about why NRC's proposed rule is unacceptable from environmental, public health, and legal perspectives:

- * NRC has no legal authority to usurp EPA's legally mandated jurisdiction, under the Energy Policy Act of 1992, to set radiation release, public health, and environmental protection standards for the proposed Yucca Mountain repository.

As mentioned above, the NRC's proposed rule should be withdrawn, until EPA promulgates standards, at which time NRC can then modify its repository licensing rule to meet the EPA standards, as required by law.

- * Why should Nevadans living near the proposed Yucca Mountain repository be less protected from radioactive contamination of their water supply than, say, New Mexicans living near WIPP? The NRC rule proposes a lesser standard of protection for Yucca Mountain releases, despite the fact that local Nevadans will also be exposed to radioactivity from two other sources: the Nevada Test Site, and the Beatty "low level" radioactive waste dump. Since groundwater contamination would deliver Yucca's worst doses of radioactivity to nearby residents, water quality must be protected to the fullest extent of the law, which this proposed NRC rule fails to do. Yucca Mountain should have the most stringent of standards, for leakage will only increase over time. Such stringent standards would guard against an unsafe location being licensed for the repository.

- * This NRC proposed rule does not assure adequate protection for future generations of people who would be exposed to radionuclide releases from the proposed Yucca Mountain repository.

- * The proposed rule does not limit the thermal energy output of high-level radioactive waste per unit area of the repository emplacement area, which is a critical design and safety shortcoming. Yucca Mountain's rock may not be capable of containing such high levels of thermal heat and radioactivity.

- * Lots can change in 10,000 years. Due to the tremendous uncertainty associated with the proposed Yucca Mountain repository, radiation protection standards for the public health and the environment should be more stringent, rather than the less stringent standards NRC puts forth in this proposed rule.

- * This NRC proposed rule seriously underestimates the potential dangers associated with future, unpredictable human intrusions over the next several centuries or millennia which could breach the proposed repository at Yucca Mountain.

- * Despite the complexity and decades-long process involved with the Yucca Mountain repository proposal, this NRC rule would weaken or undo the requirement that DOE systematically record its decisions that significantly concern safety, how those decisions were made, and what factors influenced them. Given the grave consequences of radiation leakage from a repository, systematic accountability on scientific and engineering decisions related to safety must be upheld.

Comments should be mailed to:

Secretary

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001
attn. Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff