AMERICAN NUCLEAR SOCIETY, IDAHO FALLS, ID, JOHN COMMANDER

PAGE 1 OF 1

IANS Statement Re: Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement

My name is John Commander. I am Vice-Chair of the Idaho Section of the American Nuclear Society, and represent some 900 members located predominately in Southeast Idaho. On behalf of the section, I would like to make a statement concerning the Storage and Disposition of Weapons Usable Fissile Materials Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

We believe that all of the long term storage options are acceptable from the standpoint of safety and environmental impact; however' the option for the Collocation of the Plutonium and Highly Enriched Uranium receives our support as the most favorable alternative. We also believe that any of the Long Term Storage sites proposed could be designed to be acceptable. 1/08.03.01

We believe that the Plutonium Disposition Alternatives which involve disposal with out utilization as fuel for use in reactors are unacceptable. We support the recommendations contained in the ANS Special Report on the Protection and Management of Plutonium (Special Panel Report, Glen T. Seaborg August 1995). This report recommended implementation of the reactor irradiation option for disposal of surplus weopons-usable plutonium. 2/08.03.01

The Special Panel Report also recommended continuation of development work on reprocessing and breeder (Integral Fast Reactor) as a promising approach to proliferation-resistant fuel cycle. We strongly support this recommendation also. 3/14.00.00

Sincerely,
John Commander

170 Fieldstream Lane
Idaho Falls, ID. 83404

ID-004

08 03 01 Comment Number 1

The Department of Energy acknowledges the commentor's support for the Collocation Alternative. Decisions on storage alternatives will be based upon environmental analyses, technical and economic studies, national policy considerations, and public input.

08 03 01 Comment Number 2

The Department of Energy acknowledges the commentor's support for Pu disposition in reactors. Decisions on disposition will be made based upon environmental analyses, technical and economic studies, national policy considerations, and public input.

14 00 00 Comment Number 3

During the screening of alternatives for inclusion in the PEIS, a Reactor-Burning concept was evaluated involving a variation of the Integral Fast Reactor concept. However, this concept, which would use a reactor fuel cycle design still requiring development, would be more costly and require a longer timeframe than other mature reactor options. The development program was terminated by the Administration and Congressional action. Since Pu disposition can be accomplished using existing technologies, this advanced technology for Pu disposition is less reasonable than other Reactor Alternatives for Pu disposition.