

010294

Subj: Comments on the SDEIS on 7/6/01 via the website
 Date: 7/6/2001 4:47:24 PM Pacific Daylight Time
 From: Nonuclearwaste
 To: Nonuclearwaste

RECEIVED

JUL 10 2001

- 1 | 1) The emergency response procedures are not adequately addressed for Accident in the Las Vegas Valley or
 other Population Centers. Coordination with all local and state agencies. |
- 2 | 2) Define the Capable Faults under the NRC regulations for Nuclear Generating Station Siting. | No design basis 3
 given for differential ground displacement from one of the faults going through the underground repository. |
 Provide accident analysis for this Design Basis Accident, where a major tunnel was damaged. | Address 4
 retrievability. | Since the drip shields are to be installed later. Addressed accelerated corrosion and release for this 5
 Design Basis. |
- 6 | 3) Could a Nuclear Generating Station be sited at Yucca Mountain? Is the criteria for 1000's of cores less
 demanding than a single core? Explain rational from a scientific and engineering point of view not the political
 excuse "They Made me do It!"
- 7 | 4) The impact on the propose Native American Indian Cultural Center at either the Moapa River or Las Vegas
 Reservations has not boon address? What is the socoeconomim impact of four shipments a day by these
 proposed Centers? Lost is potential Attendance.
- 8 | 5) Address the impact of rail shipments from Caliente to Apex on the proposed Tourist Train from the Moapa
 River Reservation to Caliente via Rainbow Canyon.
- 9 | 6) Explain how and where the Heavy Haul Shipping Casts are loaded. Current Spent Fuel Building have limits on
 cask size. Define the limit for all existing nuclear stations.
- 10 | 7) The preferred design of the repository shall to selected. If the existing spent fuel is too hot for immediate burial
 then it should stay out of Nevada.
- 11 | 8) The security measures for the Transportation of the Spent Fuel shall be identified before a Final EIS is issued.
 A public comment period and public hearing shall be provided.
- 12 | 9) Define the NRC's licensing process. When will the NRC make a determination on the Scientific and Engineering
 suitability for a geologic repository? Before or after the DOE's recommendation.
- 13 | 10) What is DOE's justification on not using appropriate engineering and scientific methodology to identify the best
 geologic repository? Use of Poitlcal decesions to solve engineering problems is not a good rational
- 14 | 11) The submittal of comments on this website is poorly designed. There is no way to paste in comments from a
 word processor. Further, a copy of the submitted comments is not sent to preparer or others for a record.
- 15 | 12) Yucca Mountain should not be used as an above ground Interim Storage area to met the Federal
 Government's obligation to take ownership of the Spent Fuel. Interim Storage near the Stations should be sited to
 age the Spent Fuel if needed. | Also, | Reprocessing and Transuranic mution options to reduce the High level waste
 should be addressed in the DEIS under the Alternative to the Project Section. | 16
- 17 | | I need more time to fully review all the Yucca Mountain documents. I request another 45 days. |