

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM - 013
E-RIDS= ADM-03
Add= C. Pineda (CLSI)

As of: 11/20/15 1:12 PM
Received: November 16, 2015
Status: Pending Post
Tracking No. 1jz-8mam-3iob
Comments Due: November 20, 2015
Submission Type: Web

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

Docket: NRC-2015-0051

Department of Energy; Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada; Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Comment On: NRC-2015-0051-0004

Department of Energy; Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada; Correction and Extension of Comment Period

Document: NRC-2015-0051-DRAFT-0043

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-23510

56

Submitter Information

Name: Susan Michetti

Address:

605 Sheila st
Mt Horeb, 53572

Email: sunlightrising@gmail.com

8/21/2015
@FR 50875

RECEIVED

2015 NOV 20 PM 2: 02

RULES AND REGULATIONS

General Comment

docket ID NRC-2015-0051

Re Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada, Correction and Extension of Comment Period.

Yucca Mountain should be rejected as a nuclear waste repository site. The most obvious problem exists because the facts prove that rainwater gets into the storage area of the mountain, showing it leaks, is unstable for nuclear waste, and not contained tightly.

The NRC failed to evaluate all factors, data, assumptions by DOE. This is not rigorous science that is reliable or dependable for the baseline science of where all decisions start. This is not professional Environmental Impact analysis. This is corrupted science that causes predictable accidents involving explosions, leakage, and radioactivity outside the assumed containment. This is incompetence. We must treat nuclear waste with great seriousness, not as a joke for which the actual outcome is irrelevant. When we treat nuclear waste seriously, we do not leave any scientific stone unturned. We make sure that the facts are actually known, that the facts are dependably replicated, and that controversy is fully explained from all viewpoints. Then controversy causes more work as controversy means that more than one scenario must be developed in as full of detail as possible to be tested with the complete set of facts to the maximum extent possible. This is the type of seriousness and professional treatment required of radioactive substances including nuclear waste.

The container design and performance must be resolved by DOE. The TSPA analysis result must be adjusted in order to begin a Draft SEIS without assumptions that create big holes that destroy all semblance of scientific rigor, analysis, and knowledge. Until we have this information, we can not pass so-to-speak "Go" to finish an EIS.

The waste inventory has not been identified, let alone characterized properly into the EIS and License Application. Waste inventory must be clearly identified by origin with radioactive content and amount identified--before a Draft SEIS can claim any reliability or dependability upon which to start to build the future scenarios.

The heat load needs to be studied for its effects across time in terms of the complete re-design required. The impacts of thermal changes upon other processes must be considered, such as metal corrosion, moisture present, stress on the rock, seismic activity, and other important factors. This must be identified early.

Yet, we already know that Yucca leaks. We know rainwater penetrates the top of Yucca Mountain and gets into the mountain where the storage presumably might occur. We know that moisture and radioactive storage do not get along. We know that moisture cannot be present with radioactive storage or we might have explosions and endanger workers as well as endangering the neighboring community downwind when the radionuclides from an explosion escape through the same pathways that the rain water currently penetrates from the top of the mountain into the storage area. All of this occurs before we start talking about ventilation system problems.

Then, we have other issues, like the unfairness towards indigenous populations who do not want to be harmed.

Yucca Mountain is unsatisfactory site for nuclear waste repository.

Respectfully,