



Public Service Commission of Wisconsin

Daniel R. Ebert, Chairperson
Mark Meyer, Commissioner
Lauren Azar, Commissioner

610 North Whitney Way
P.O. Box 7854
Madison, WI 53707-7854

January 8, 2008

RRR000757

EIS Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management
1551 Hillshire Drive
Las Vegas, NV 89134

Re: Comments on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for a Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada

Dear Sir or Madam:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for a Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain (Yucca Mountain SEIS).

I [The state of Wisconsin has a continuing and vested interest in the establishment of a national repository for the disposal of spent nuclear fuel. Wisconsin has three operational nuclear-powered generation units and one decommissioned unit. As of June 30, 2007, Wisconsin ratepayers have paid \$630.4 million, including interest, into the Nuclear Waste Fund intended for use in the construction of a permanent repository for high-level waste. I remain deeply disappointed and concerned about delays in opening Yucca Mountain.

On September 14, 2001, the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin (Commission) commented on the recommendation from the Secretary of Energy to the President that Yucca Mountain was a suitable site for the geologic disposal of spent nuclear fuel. The Commission's position was that the interests of the citizens of Wisconsin would be best served by the ultimate disposal of spent nuclear fuel in a geologic repository such as the one being evaluated at Yucca Mountain. Even considering the possibility of recycling spent nuclear fuel, I continue to believe that a geologic repository such as Yucca Mountain is necessary for the ultimate disposal of high-level nuclear waste.

I do not believe the No-Action alternative set out in the Yucca Mountain SEIS is acceptable. First, such alternative would allow spent nuclear fuel to remain at sites that, while currently safe, were never intended to be permanent storage facilities. Second, and most importantly, such alternative would not meet the requirement of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act that the Federal Government dispose of high-level radioactive waste in a geologic repository.]

EIS Office

Page 2

2 [In addition, I believe the Yucca Mountain SEIS should include a discussion of the potential environmental impacts that would result from recasking spent nuclear fuel for shipment to Yucca Mountain. This recasking would be necessary for spent-fuel assemblies currently stored in storage-only casks. This handling of spent nuclear fuel in Wisconsin would likely not be necessary had the Department of Energy (DOE) accepted shipment of spent fuel on the schedule set out in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. Recasking of spent fuel assemblies may also be necessary for fuel stored in dual purpose casks, depending on DOE's willingness to accept these casks from facilities that choose to continue to use them (rather than the proposed TAD canisters) for on-site storage.]

For the more technical aspects of the Yucca Mountain SEIS, I must rely on the expertise of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, DOE scientists developing the repository application, and a thorough and complete review by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and its technical staff.

Sincerely,



Daniel R. Ebert
Chairperson

DRE::L:\draft\draft SEIS for YM repository comments

cc: Jeff Kitsemel - PSCW