

EIS000186

October 27, 1999

RECEIVED

NOV 02 1999

Wendy R. Dixon
EIS Project Manager, M/S 010
U.S. Department of Energy
Yucca Mountain Site
Characterization Office
P.O. Box 30307
North Las Vegas, Nevada 89036-0307

Dear Ms. Dixon

I am writing to comment on the draft environmental impact statement that the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) has issued related to its ongoing efforts to site the proposed Yucca Mountain repository for isolating the nation's commercial used nuclear fuel.

I work in the Vendor Programs group of the Nuclear Oversight Department at Virginia Power, which safely operates the North Anna and Surry power stations. As a Virginia Power Nuclear employee, I can tell you that nuclear safety is of paramount importance, and decisions regarding handling, storing and moving used fuel at our facilities are made conservatively to ensure employees and the public are protected.

1 While Virginia Power has been demonstrated that used nuclear fuel can be safely stored in dry storage containers at the reactor sites, this is and should be only a temporary solution. And I oppose the no-action alternatives in the draft EIS that would have the fuel remain on site permanently.

Instead, it makes more sense from a public safety perspective to keep this fuel at a secure central location, isolated in a licensed repository specifically designed for this purpose. It makes no sense to keep used nuclear fuel on site near large bodies of water – as some repository opponents have proposed – especially since there are years of experience in safely transporting the material. Additionally, I would think it more economical to have the US Government inspect one site for compliance than all the individual utility sites.

(1)

EIS000186

2


Since the draft EIS does not identify any potential environmental impacts that would be the basis for not proceeding with the proposed repository, I urge DOE to move ahead to resolve this important issue. Already, there has been an extraordinary body of credible and conservative scientific evidence that continues to support moving forward with the Yucca Mountain project. Indeed, Yucca Mountain has undergone scientific study for over a decade and is probably one of the most extensively studied pieces of real estate in the world.

As you know, electricity from safe nuclear power plants represents about 20 percent of the overall energy mix in the United States. These plants make this electricity very cleanly. It is important that we preserve this safe technology so that future generations can continue to enjoy its clean air benefits. It is also important that we do not push off on the next generation the burden of dealing with used commercial nuclear fuel by not moving ahead with the proposed repository. |

3

I urge you to continue with your preferred alternative to address a permanent solution to the used nuclear fuel problem – completing the technical review for storing this material at Yucca Mountain. Scientific facts, not emotional reactions and conjecture, should govern the Department's ultimate decision on the proposed Yucca Mountain site. |

Sincerely,



James D. Faehl
10029 Mosswood Road
Richmond, VA 23236

(2)