COMMENT FORM
These comments apply to the Storage and Disposition Draft PEIS

NAME: Joy Myers
ADDRESS: HC 62 Box 41, Dubois, ID 83423
TELEPHONE: (208) 374-5359

As the criteria against which to judge potential alternatives were based on the President's nonproliferation policy, it appears to me that nonproliferation aspects should be addressed in the Storage and Disposition Draft PEIS specifically as they relate to each alternative. Page S-5 of the Summary states: "The criteria include nonproliferation; security; environment, safety, and health; timeliness and technological viability; cost-effectiveness; international cooperation; and peaceful beneficial reuse whenever possible." Analysis of the alternatives addresses only a few of these criteria. 1/01.06.00

For instance, the Long-term Storage Alternatives all appear to violate the stated criteria. Leaving surplus fissile material in its present form and in long-term storage sets a poor example for both nonproliferation efforts and international cooperation. Would the United States be content if the former Soviet Union agreed to merely place its surplus fissile material into long-term storage? Is this really any different than stockpiling? While it is presumable that consolidation and/or collocation would help address the security criterion, such analysis is missing from the PEIS. A discussion of the cost-effectiveness of upgrading or constructing long-term storage facilities without actually eliminating surplus fissile material is also missing. No where is the preference for peaceful beneficial reuse mentioned. 2/01.04.00 3/07.01.00 4/01.05.00

Under the Disposition Alternatives, much of the above paragraph also applies to the Deep Borehole Direct Disposition Alternative. Assumedly, security considerations may be improved, but this approach is in reality merely another version of long-term storage. By using a generic site for analysis, the PEIS ignores the problems inherent in attempting to locate and open such a facility anywhere in the United States. Are areas which meet the deep borehole standards even available? Such practical and political considerations need, at least, a mention. The Deep Borehole Immobilized Disposition Alternative is an improvement, but it also neglects to consider the peaceful beneficial reuse criterion in addition to the problem of attempting to site such a waste facility. 5/04.03.00 6/04.02.00

Based on the environmental, safety and health information contained in the PEIS, the Electrometallurgical Treatment Alternative is clearly preferable in the immobilization category. Impacts on waste management at the INEL appear to be small; and, according to Governor Batt's statement, surplus fissile material would be acceptable under the conditions of the Idaho Agreement if it were shipped to the INEL for treatment. The ability of this process to produce LEU from HEU has the potential for meeting both the nonproliferation standard as well as the beneficial reuse standard. In addition, the process could have the capability of immobilizing the forms of PU not suitable for MOX fabrication. 7/08.03.01

F-005

01 06 00 Comment Number 1

The purpose of the Proposed Action is, in part, to establish the technical and program infrastructure that will enable the United States to take unilateral action or negotiate reciprocal actions with other nations for the disposition of surplus weapons-usable Pu. This PEIS addresses the environmental impacts of the reasonable alternatives for DOE's Proposed Action. Analyses of the cost, schedule, technical, and Nonproliferation Policy impacts are described in separate documents to support DOE's ROD. The documents related to technical, cost, and schedule analyses were made available for public review beginning in July 1996. The nonproliferation analysis was made available to the public beginning in October 1996. DOE also conducted a series of public meetings, prior to the issuance of the Final PEIS, to discuss the analysis of the Nonproliferation Policy as it relates to the Proposed Action and alternatives.

01 04 00 Comment Number 2

The intent of DOE's Proposed Action is to provide storage for the nonsurplus weapons-usable fissile materials and for surplus Pu materials pending disposition, since the disposition action would take time. The impacts of the Proposed Action and reasonable alternatives on implementation of the President's Nonproliferation Policy are analyzed in a separate document in support of the ROD.

07 01 00 Comment Number 3

Cost data, along with technical and schedule data, was provided in Technical Summary Reports of both storage and disposition beginning in late July 1996.

01 05 00 Comment Number 4

Additional benefits were included in the criteria for the screening process which led to the alternatives which were analyzed in the PEIS.

04 03 00 Comment Number 5

As noted in Chapter 2 of the PEIS, identification of a suitable site for a deep borehole is beyond the scope of this PEIS. Regarding suitable geology,

MYERS, JOY, DUBOIS, ID
PAGE 2 OF 3

Comments - Storage and Disposition Draft PEIS Page 2
Joy Myers

Based on the criteria identified in the PEIS, the best approach for disposition of surplus weapons-usable fissile material is to convert it for use in a reactor. No other alternative meets the standard of "peaceful beneficial reuse whenever possible" – and the PEIS acknowledges it is possible. Also, converting surplus weapons-usable material into reactor fuel would meet the Spent Fuel Standard and reduce proliferation risks. This will be the most likely approach in other countries, and the PEIS would benefit from a discussion of international cooperation vis-à-vis standards for and methods of disposition of fissile material. 8/06.00.08 9/01.03.00

Perhaps the largest flaw apparent in the PEIS is the reluctance of the Department of Energy to decide whether weapons-usable fissile material is or is not waste. While the PEIS states that this material is not waste, three-fourths of the PEIS treats its disposition as if it were. Immobilized disposition merely confirms it is waste. Only reuse will demonstrate that it is not. 10/01.02.00

The argument used at the workshop that utilities are "not going to pay to get this stuff ... we may have to pay them to take it" misses the point. Reuse holds the only potential for beneficial use. Taxpayers are going to pay equally or more for the other proposed alternatives through mortgage, immobilization, and disposal costs with no prospect of return. This seems like an ideal opportunity for the Department of Energy to give some credence to the "Energy" in its title and mission. 11/07.02.00

F-005

Section 3.9.5 notes potential host rock media for a deep borehole site in the contiguous United States.

04 02 00 Comment Number 6

While the Borehole Alternative offers no potentially beneficial use of this material, this lack of access makes it difficult to divert to weapons use.

08 03 01 Comment Number 7

The Department of Energy acknowledges the commentor's support for the Electrometallurgical Treatment Alternative. Decisions on disposition of weapons-usable fissile materials will be based upon environmental analyses, technical and economic studies, national policy considerations, existing agreements, and public input.

06 00 08 Comment Number 8

Comment noted.

01 03 00 Comment Number 9

The PEIS focuses on the environmental impacts of each alternative. DOE's decision process will be based on the results of the Final PEIS, together with information from technical and economic studies, national policy objectives, and public input. This process will provide the United States with the basis and flexibility to implement Pu disposition efforts multilaterally, bilaterally through negotiations, or unilaterally as an example to Russia and other nations.

01 02 00 Comment Number 10

The AEA materials (including special nuclear materials such as weapons-usable fissile materials) are excluded from the definition of solid waste under RCRA and its implementing regulations, as stated in the *Solid Waste Disposal Act*, Section 1004. Furthermore, Section 1006 states that RCRA does not apply to any materials that are subject to the AEA.

All reasonable alternatives for surplus Pu disposition analyzed in the PEIS would generate wastes. The environmental impacts of the various wastes are discussed in Section 4.3 and Appendix E.

07 02 00 Comment Number 11

Cost data, along with technical and schedule data, were provided in a Technical Summary Report for disposition beginning in late July 1996. This report included consideration for reactor fuel cost offsets that could be realized by using MOX fuel in existing reactors as a discussion of possible revenues that could be realized from the sale of electricity or steam from a new or partially completed reactor using MOX fuel and net life cycle costs.