

5/20/96

Allyn Niles
Box 363
Ruth, NV 89319

Mr. William Knoll
Department of the Navy
Code NAVSEA 08U
2531 Jefferson Davis Hwy.
Arlington, VA 22242-5160

Dear Mr. Knoll,

Thank you for including me in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement process in deciding for a Container System for the Management of Naval Spent Nuclear Fuel.

After having read parts of the DEIS it would seem that the most acceptable methods for containment are the No-Action Alternative and the Current Technology/Rail although the fewer number of total shipments with the CTR may be advantageous in the long run over the NAA. I feel that these methods have proven themselves reliable through years of use and will in all likelihood continue to be a suitable containment program until a permanent storage facility is constructed.

A

Sincerely,



Allyn Niles

Commenter: Allyn Niles, Nevada

Response to Comment:

- A. In Chapter 3, Section 3.8, Comparison of Alternatives, the EIS states that the impacts for most categories are small or nonexistent for all alternatives. Since 1957, the Navy has safely shipped over 660 containers of spent nuclear fuel from the shipyards and prototype sites to the Naval Reactors Facility. All of the shipments were made safely by rail and without release of radioactivity. Since any container alternative selected for dry storage and transportation (either by rail, heavy-haul truck, or a combination of both) must meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 71, Packaging and Transportation of Radioactive Material, and 10 CFR Part 72, Licensing Requirements for the Independent Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Waste, other containers can also be used safely and reliably.