



**LOC** INC  
Oak Ridge Reservation  
Local Oversight Committee

010175

RECEIVED

JUL 02 2001

June 26, 2001

Dr. Jane R. Summerson  
EIS Document Manager  
U.S. Department of Energy  
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management  
Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office  
P.O. Box 30307, Mail Stop 010  
North Las Vegas, NV 89036-0307

*Subject: Comments on Supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada (DOE/EIS-0250-D-S)*

Dear Dr. Summerson:

The Citizens' Advisory Panel (CAP) of the Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR) Local Oversight Committee, Inc., (LOC) voted to submit comments on DOE/EIS-0250-D-S, the Supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for a Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) and High-Level Radioactive Waste (HLW) at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada. The LOC Board has not had the opportunity to review and approve these comments, and so they should be considered as submitted by the CAP only.

The LOC is a non-profit regional organization funded by the State of Tennessee and established to provide local government and citizen input into the environmental management and operation of the DOE ORR. The Board of Directors of the LOC is composed of elected and appointed officials from the City of Oak Ridge and the seven counties surrounding and downstream of the ORR, and the chair of the CAP. The CAP has up to 20 members with diverse backgrounds who represent the greater ORR region.

The CAP has closely followed and provided comment on previous documents concerning the disposition of surplus weapons-grade materials, including highly enriched uranium and plutonium. The Records of Decision for both of these included options for conversion and fabrication into reactor fuel with subsequent disposition as SNF. In addition, the importance of a life-cycle waste solution to the overall health of the nuclear industry is of utmost importance. A healthy nuclear industry may also contribute to environmentally sound efforts to reduce the nation's carbon dioxide emissions and lessen the impact of global warming.

The CAP is pleased that the SDEIS is responsive to our referenced comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DOE/EIS-0250D) by incorporating the following features:

1. Working towards the reduction of uncertainty through design improvement including greater flexibility in packaging, "aging" SNF, increased protection from water intrusion, greater drift spacing, and increased ventilation;
2. Providing analysis that includes closure 300 years beyond completion of emplacement; and

**Anderson • Meigs • Rhea • Roane • City of Oak Ridge • Knox • Loudon • Morgan**

3. Providing a comparison of key design and operating parameters in the Draft EIS and the SDEIS.

The CAP recommends the following information should be provided in the Final EIS that is not currently available in the Draft EIS and SDEIS:

1. Analysis should go beyond the proportional use of primary impact indicators as given in the SDEIS;
2. The inventory given in Appendix A of the Draft EIS should be revised to include 20-year license extensions for commercial nuclear power plants;
3. Since additional inventory has been analyzed and the Total System Life Cycle Cost (TSLCC) document (DOE/RW-0533) includes "all SNF and HLW currently forecast," a clear statement of the DOE strategy beyond the legal limit on this action (70,000 MTHM) is required; and
4. The Final EIS should show a preference for particular scenarios and operating modes. The repository layout for the preferred design should be adequately addressed in Section 3 as well as in an updated version of Appendix I of the Draft EIS.

Please consider these additional comments:

1. It is not clear that the "S&ER flexible design" discussed in the SDEIS is the same as that used in the TSLCC document which uses a "Reference System Design" ("capable of emplacing 97,000 MTHM") from a "Project Description Document" not made available to the public. The FEIS should clarify this.
2. The recently published EPA Public Health and Environmental Radiation Standards for Yucca Mountain should be addressed in the Final EIS and summarized in an appendix.
3. Since the Draft EIS is based on the preliminary design concept and the SDEIS on the S&ER flexible design, the Final EIS should state that a Supplement to the Final EIS will be prepared if further design evolution occurs which is selected for implementation.

The CAP appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the Supplement to the Draft EIS for a Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada. Please include our organization on the distribution list for the Final EIS and the Record of Decision.

Sincerely,



Norman Mulvenon  
Chair, LOC Citizens' Advisory Panel

Enclosures

cc: Pat Halsey, FFA Administrative  
Coordinator, DOE ORO  
Spencer Abraham, Secretary of Energy  
Representative Zach Wamp  
Representative John J. Duncan, Jr.

Representative Van Hilleary  
Senator Bill Frist  
Senator Fred Thompson  
Richard Cheney, Vice President of the  
United States



**LOC** INC  
Oak Ridge Reservation  
Local Oversight Committee

February 9, 2000

Wendy R. Dixon, EIS Project Manager  
Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office  
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management  
U.S. Department of Energy  
P.O. Box 30307, Mail Stop 010  
North Las Vegas, NV 89036-0307

*Subject: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada (DOE/EIS-0250D)*

Dear Ms. Dixon:

The Citizens' Advisory Panel (CAP) of the Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR) Local Oversight Committee, Inc., (LOC) voted to submit comments on DOE/EIS-0250D, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) and High-Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada. The LOC Board has not had the opportunity to review and approve these comments, and so they should be considered as submitted by the CAP only.

The LOC is a non-profit regional organization funded by the State of Tennessee and established to provide local government and citizen input into the environmental management and operation of the DOE ORR. The Board of Directors of the LOC is composed of elected and appointed officials from the City of Oak Ridge and the seven counties surrounding and downstream of the ORR, and the chair of the CAP. The CAP has up to 20 members with diverse backgrounds who represent the greater ORR region.

Appropriate disposal (or recycling) of SNF is a necessary component of the nuclear industry fuel life cycle. Nuclear power is a key means of reducing U.S. carbon dioxide emissions and lessening the potential for global warming. On previous occasions, the CAP has reviewed and/or commented on documents concerning the disposition of surplus weapons-grade materials, including highly enriched uranium and plutonium. The Records of Decision for both of these included conversion and fabrication into reactor fuel with subsequent disposition as SNF.

The CAP endorses the Preferred Alternative to proceed with the Proposed Action for 70,000 metric tons of heavy metal (MTHM) as described in Section 2.6 of the draft EIS. The CAP's support is based in part on the small short-term (about 100 years) impacts and the lower cost of the Proposed Action (\$28.8 billion) relative to that of the No-Action Alternative (\$51.5 to \$56.7 billion). The preferred alternative in the draft EIS supports the nation's goal of nonproliferation, as well as DOE's Environmental Management program by the inclusion of about 7,000 MTHM of DOE SNF and high-level radioactive waste.

Potential long-term (100 to 10,000 years) impacts seem to be fairly well understood but understandably with more uncertainty than the short-term impacts (e.g. Table 5-3, page 5-22). Impacts beyond 10,000 years seem to need additional modeling, and DOE plans additional studies as discussed on page 5-13. The CAP would like to see results included in the final EIS.

The CAP finds it appropriate that the draft EIS considers the following elements: additional inventory, a retrieval contingency; receipt prior to the start of emplacement; three packaging scenarios; three thermal load scenarios; and multiple transportation scenarios (both national and within Nevada).

3

The mitigation measure to delay repository closure up to 300 years (page 9-16) should be seriously considered by DOE. This would leave the option for retrieval and waste recycling or destruction using future technologies as a viable alternative.

Based on the LOC's experience in Oak Ridge with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) mitigation plans for local DOE environmental decisions, the CAP strongly recommends that local and tribal governments be consulted during mitigation planning and implementation. Although this is not required by NEPA, it would add an important element of public acceptance to the highly charged political environment surrounding this issue. The question of long-term funding for stewardship of the site should also be addressed in the final EIS.

The following are specific comments about the document:

1. The repository layout for the low thermal load scenario (Figure 2-16 on page 2-26) has not been adequately addressed in Section 3. Figures 3-7 and 3-8 (pages 3-22 and 3-23) could be modified to include the low thermal load footprint and additional discussion could be added to the text as necessary.
2. The final EIS should show a preference for particular scenarios where multiple scenarios are discussed.
3. Since the draft EIS is based on the preliminary design concept, the final EIS, if based on a later design, should state the difference or it should state that a Supplemental EIS would be prepared if the later more mature design significantly changes the analysis.
4. There are several problems where words state that a figure or table shows something that it doesn't, as noted below:
  - a. Page 8-7 – the text in the second bullet gives different (and lower) ranges for the number of waste packages than the totals for each category in referenced Table 8-34 (page 8-60).
  - b. Page 8-74, activity 2 – this description incorrectly states that Figure 8-3 (page 8-11) shows the locations of underground nuclear tests; the location of the nuclear and high explosive test zones are, however, shown on Figure 3-2 (page 3-8).

The CAP appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft EIS for a Geologic Repository for the Disposal of SNF and High-Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada. If you have any questions, please call me at 865-483-1333.

Sincerely,



Norman A. Mulvenon  
Chair, LOC Citizens' Advisory Panel

cc: LOC document registry  
Earl Leming, Director, TDEC DOE-O  
Bill Richardson, Secretary of Energy  
Representative Zach Wamp  
Representative John J. Duncan, Jr.  
Representative Van Hilleary  
Senator Bill Frist  
Senator Fred Thompson  
Vice President Al Gore