



the
**Chickasaw
Nation** HEADQUARTERS

Arlington at Mississippi / Box 1548 / Ada, OK 74821-1548 / (580) 436-2603

Bill Anoatubby
Governor

Jefferson Keel
Lieutenant
Governor

January 7, 2008

Ms. Corinne Macaluso
c/o Ms. Patricia Temple
Bechtel SAIC, LLC
955 North L'Enfant Plaza SW. Suite 8000
Washington, DC 20024

Dear Ms. Macaluso:

Subject: U.S. Department of Energy Request for Comments
Transportation of radioactive materials to Yucca Mountain repository

The Chickasaw Nation received a notice from the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, requesting comments on the proposed revised policy on Section 180 (c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act


The DOE plans to ship radioactive materials along a route lying within the Chickasaw Nation. The Chickasaw Nation is interested in obtaining the necessary training for our first responders, including our Lighthouse Police Department and fire department.

Also included with this letter are answers to the six specific questions cited in the Federal Register notice.

Please direct any questions regarding these projects to the attention of Mr. Mack Peterson, environmental section head, the Chickasaw Nation Division of Housing and Tribal Development, at (580) 272-5400.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter

Sincerely,


Bill Anoatubby, Governor
The Chickasaw Nation



God Bless America!

The Department of Energy has requested interested parties comment on this notice of revised proposed policy, including the specific questions identified below:

Question 1

- (a) Would \$200,000 be an appropriate amount for the assessment and planning grant to conduct an initial needs assessment? **Yes**
- (b) Should the amount be the same for each eligible State and Tribe? **Yes**
- (c) Would there be a need to update the initial needs assessment and, if so, at what intervals and should funding be made available for this purposes in what amount? **Yes, the assessment should be updated every 3 years since records for most grants are kept for 3 years after the grant is closed. The allocation amount should be a base of \$100,000 to update the assessment plan**

Question 2

- (a) Would \$100,000 be an appropriate amount for the annual training grant? **Yes**
- (b) Recognizing that, after commencement of shipments through an eligible State or Tribe, training to maintain capability may become less costly with increased expertise and efficiency, should the base amount of subsequent annual training grants be adjusted downward to reflect the number of years that annual training grants have been received? **No, the training of new personnel due to turnover or increase in the number of personnel is needed, therefore, the base amount**
- (c) What should be allocation of available appropriated funds for a fiscal year between the base amount and the variable amount of the annual training grants? **Based upon the Department of Energy's allocation formula, the funds should be allocated to areas of extreme risk given the priority.**
- (d) Should the entire training grant be variable based on the funding allocation formula described herein? **No, a base of \$100,000 will provide the needed training to a substantial amount of personnel**

Question 3

- (a) Should the amount of funding be adjusted where a route forms a border between two States, a State and a Tribal reservation, or two Tribal reservations? **No, funding should remain the same throughout**
- (b) Should State or Tribes with mutual aid responsibilities along a route outside their borders be eligible for 180(c) grants on the basis of the mutual aid agreement grant? **Yes, they will remain impacted by a spill and should know how to assist the problem**
- (c) If so, how should the amount of funding be calculated and should the funding be calculation take into account whether or not the State or Tribe would otherwise be eligible for a grant? **Funding should be calculated using the allocation formula of the recipient state's (State or Tribal) responsibility.**

