

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

500 SOUTH MAIN STREET
BISHOP, CA 93514

(619) 872-0658

10

June 3, 1996

File: Iny-Misc.-1

Mr. William Knoll
Department of the Navy
Code NAVSEA 08U
2581 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia 22242-5160

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR A CONTAINER SYSTEM
FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF NAVAL SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL

A Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a Container System for the Management of Naval Spent Nuclear Fuel. Our only comment at this time is that the document seems to make a good case for shipment of Naval nuclear waste entirely by rail. If you have questions on this matter, please call me at (619) 872-0658.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "for Robert J. Lubbock".
DENNIS MANNING

Associate Transportation Planner

DM:mam

Commenter: Dennis Manning - State of California, Department of Transportation, California

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.