ROCKY MOUNTAIN CONFERENCE, UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST
ROBERT A. KINSEY
PAGE 1 OF 1

MOX fuel is a bad idea. It further extends the Nuclear Power industry which has no intelligent idea – nor does anyone, including the DOE – about responsible ways for dealing with the increased nuclear waste. I mean using it to make depleted uranium ordinance is about as irresponsible as you can get and yet you allow that. Using it to power space craft that could crash into the atmosphere is another example of irresponsibility. So employing weapons grade Plutonium to make electricity is encouraging the production of more waste. All you seem to be able to think about is underground storage and have ignored for years the suggestion of nuclear guardianship as a way of warning future generations that we really don't know what to do with waste. Comments made at "Stakeholder hearings" are regularly discounted by your establishment and often don't even make it into print in the volumes you create out of our forests. When is the DOE going to stop being a tool of the nuclear power and nuclear weapons 1

WR003

WR003–1 **MOX Approach**

DOE acknowledges the commentor's opposition to the MOX approach. Use of MOX fuel in domestic, commercial reactors is not proposed in order to subsidize the commercial nuclear power industry or produce electricity. Rather, the purpose of this proposed action is to safely and securely disposition surplus plutonium by meeting the Spent Fuel Standard. The Spent Fuel Standard, as identified by NAS and modified by DOE, is to make the surplus weapons-usable plutonium as inaccessible and unattractive for weapons use as the much larger and growing quantity of plutonium that exists in spent nuclear fuel from commercial power reactors. Use of nuclear materials to make depleted uranium ordinance or for use in spacecraft is beyond the scope of this EIS.

DOE acknowledges the commentor's preference for nuclear guardianship. This EIS includes the No Action Alternative, whereby the surplus plutonium would remain in storage at their current DOE locations. However, this alternative does not reduce the nonproliferation concerns associated with surplus plutonium.

Comments made at "stakeholder hearings" are carefully considered by DOE. Generally, at the hearings notetakers capture the main points of issues or concerns raised by the commentors; therefore, comments are not a verbatim transcript of the hearings. DOE's notetakers make every effort to ensure the essence of each participant's comment(s) has been presented in a clear, concise, and accurate manner. In addition to oral comments received at the public hearings held for the SPD Draft EIS and the *Supplement to the SPD Draft EIS*, written comments were also accepted at the hearings or could have been submitted via fax, mail, or Web site. Equal consideration was given to all comments, regardless of how or where they were received. Decisions on the surplus plutonium disposition program will be based on environmental analyses, technical and cost reports, national policy and nonproliferation considerations, and public input.