

3/29/02
64 FR 15207
33

RECEIVED

2002 SEP -3 11:11:43

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
QUESTIONS FOR MEETING THURSDAY MAY 23, 2002 6:30-9.00 PM
CLARK COUNTY BUILDING DEPT.
4701 W. RUSSELL RD. NEAR DECATUR

In the Directives
File # 100-100
the NRC

SUPPLEMENT TO THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT May 2001 the DOE states page 2-8: "Commercial spent nuclear fuel would be the major contributor of heat in the repository... Commercial spent nuclear fuel waste package loading could be varied by ... placing younger fuel in a surface aging area to allow its heat output to dissipate so it could meet thermal goals for later emplacement... DOE would consider aging as much as 40,000 MTHM of commercial spent nuclear fuel... during a 50-year period. Aging would require an extended emplacement period." As reported in the BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS Jan./Feb. 2002 by Robert Alvarez "' On average, spent fuel ponds hold five to 10 times more long-lived radioactivity than a reactor core... According to the NRC, as much as 100 percent of a pool's cesium 137 would be released into the environment in a fire.'" The 40,000 tons of spent fuel the DOE wants to put on top of the ground at most 90 miles away from Las Vegas, as I estimate it, would be the equivalent of 15,000-20,000 nuclear fuel ponds The LAS VEGAS REVIEW JOURNAL Feb. 16, 2002 Steve Tetreault reports that Spencer Abraham stated that transportation routes and shipment schedules wouldn't be publicized. The environmental impact of this would begin possibly before today and have a potentially far greater impact on the environment than the planned tunnel repository. Why isn't the NRC requiring an Environmental Impact Statement in this issue? [Page 2-9: "For analytical purposes, DOE assumes that the receipt and emplacement of these materials would begin in 2010 and would occur over a 24-year period, except if DOE used aging to achieve the lower-temperature repository operating mode. With aging, the emplacement period would extend from 2010 until 2060.

- 2. Gary Taubes observes in MIT'S MAGAZINE OF INNOVATION TECHNOLOGY REVIEW Jan./Feb 2002 "...The more geologists have learned about Yucca Mountain... the less viable that model has become... In the past year both the National Research Council and the Harvard/University of Tokyo collaboration advanced an idea that seems to be gathering support among experts in the nuclear-waste debate. The gist of it is to slow down, rethink and do it right... The industry has learned to store spent nuclear fuel on-site in dry-storage casks. These concrete or steel casks are easy to use, easy to license and, according to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, will keep the spent fuel safe for a century. Indeed, says DOE's Williams, everyone agrees that dry-cask storage, know technically as monitored surface storage, is an adequate temporary solution to the problem of spent fuel, at least from the safety and security points of view."

Why isn't the NRC exploring this instead of putting it all together on top of the land and or in tunnels near Las Vegas?

FROM ADRIAN ZOLKOVER

Template = ADM-013

E-RTDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Ciocci (SAC3) - M. Beranek (AFB)