

JAN 13 2000

MR. VINCENT: Good afternoon. My name is John Vincent. I work for GPU Nuclear in New Jersey, and I am a senior nuclear fuel engineer responsible for new fuel procurement and the storage, disposal or transportation of spent fuel associated with the Oyster Creek nuclear power plant.

In addition, and the reason I'm here in Salt Lake City today is because we had a Private Fuel Storage board meeting yesterday and today. I serve as the technology committee chairman for the Private Fuel Storage project, which is currently planned and we're being licensed for a facility on the Skull Valley -- abandoned Goshutes reservation in Skull Valley.

This afternoon I'd like to provide some very brief comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Yucca Mountain repository project. In particular I will focus my comments on the transportation aspects of the DEIS.

1 I believe that the DEIS provides a comprehensive evaluation of the environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of the proposed Yucca Mountain repository. Specifically, it is clear that the proposed facility can be constructed and operated to adequately provide for the protection of the public health and safety. Additionally, it serves to underscore the need for such a facility and that there are clear and convincing benefits to the construction of a central repository as opposed to the distributed long-term storage of commercial spent nuclear fuel among many sites.

3... Since the Private Fuel Storage Project will transport its customers' spent nuclear fuel to the storage facility by rail, the conclusions reached by DOE and the DEIS concerning transportation are relevant to the PFS project. The last 15 years or so I have been actively supporting the ability of the nuclear industry to safely transport spent nuclear fuel and have conducted, at the least, two spent fuel transportation projects for GPU. And the conclusions of the DEIS serve to reinforce the fact that spent nuclear fuel has and will be transported safely and efficiently.

There has been ample historical evidence that safe, routine transportation of spent nuclear fuel can be accomplished. For more than three decades the domestic nuclear industry has conducted almost three thousand shipments of spent nuclear fuel without the release of radioactive material or the failure of a spent nuclear fuel cask. This is a remarkable safety record. I believe this is not the result of chance but the result of a comprehensive federal regulatory regime of cask design criteria and certification regulation, transportation regulation, and the conscious effort of the nuclear industry.

2 The DEIS evaluation of the environmental impacts of transportation emphasizes that the risks associated with the transportation of spent nuclear fuel are extremely small. Or, put another way, that the existing regulations provide an effective program for the protection of public health and safety. Spent nuclear fuel transportation has been done before both here and abroad, and that very substantial experience provides a valuable base for the safe conduct of these activities in the future.

3 cont. As I mentioned before, the conclusions of the DEIS with regard to transportation have particular relevance to the PFS project which is currently in the licensing process with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. While the transportation of spent nuclear fuel to the PFS project from our customers' reactor sites is the subject of a separate NRC licensing process, any future shipments to the repository from the PFS facility would be bounded by the evaluations of this DEIS.

I'd like to thank you for allowing me to make the comments.