

Judy Shankle

EIS000723

Mineral County's Statement to the
Department of Energy's (DOE's)
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)
for Yucca Mountain (January 11,2000/Las Vegas)

RECEIVED

JAN 11 2000

1. Mineral County believes that a number of issues are not addressed properly, not addressed adequately or not addressed at all in the Draft EIS. These issues include but are not limited to:

- 1 a. Impacts on local government programs and costs - The DEIS does not adequately address specific community, local government, statewide, and regional impacts. Rural counties do not have money to handle a radioactive accident. The cost to ensure that the rural counties would be able to accommodate the transportation of the radioactive waste, would probably exceed the no-action alternative.
- 2 b. Uncertainty in models and data used for site characterization and repository performance. Mineral County's flood plain map is incorrect. If this is so, how reliable is the information gathered for Yucca Mountain and other areas? The flood plain report in the DEIS is too generalized. Mineral County would like the EIS to contain a current and detailed flood plain analysis of Yucca Mountain and each affected county.
- 3 c. Statistics for the population and growth of Nevada is out-dated. The population of places like Las Vegas, Reno, Carson City, and Pahrump have significantly increased. With the population increase has come an increase in use of Nevada's transportation system. Along with this increase has come an increase in accidents all over Nevada. What precautions are being taken; or safe-havens being used, updated or built to ensure the safe transportation of the high-level radioactive waste? The EIS should contain this information using current data.
- 4 d. The DEIS provides a "generic" transportation analysis. Specific transcontinental routes and communities along the way are not identified. Other transportation issues of the waste to the site are:
- 5 * Mode - not clearly identified. Three possible modes of transportation are identified.
- The waste could be driven on interstates using legal-weight trucks.
- It could be sent by train which includes five options of building a railroad to Yucca Mountain (YM).
- It could be transported by "Heavy Haul" which is rail to a transfer point in Nevada, then transferred to 32-foot heavy-haul trucks and transported to YM.
- 6 * Routing - many possible routes, none studied adequately. Rural areas do not have good or safe roads to transport this nuclear waste, especially, if alternative routes are selected; nor do they have railroads to get it to Yucca Mountain.
- 7 * Land use consideration of present and planned land uses along possible routes identified - Mineral County (MC) will be promoting tourism. One area for tourism is hiking and outdoor activities. Another consideration for MC's land would be to have a private prison in an area close to one of the possible routes.
- 8 * Emergency Response - training, preparedness and funding. Rural areas do not have the necessary equipment, nor trained personnel to handle a radioactive accident.
- 9 * Terrorist/extremist threats - DOE has used old data to provide this information.
- 10 * Casks - DOE will change the design of the casks which would be used to transport the High-Level Radioactive Waste. The DEIS does not address whether the new design of the casks has been analyzed. When will the new casks be built and tested? What is the integrity of the valves, seals, and shielding? Full scale cask testing is needed rather than computer simulations.
- 11 * Weather and Natural Disasters - although weather does not seem to be an issue. Mineral County believes it is a big issue. Most of the radioactive waste would be transported through the northern part of Nevada. This part of the state may have bad

Mineral County's Statement to the
DOE's Draft Environmental Impact Statement
for Yucca Mountain (January 11, 2000/Las Vegas)

Page 2

EIS000723

11 cont'd.

weather from November to May as well as many other states from east, central, and northwest America (see Figures S-10 or S-11, attached). Will the radioactive waste be transported during this time frame? The DEIS does not have adequate information in case of road closures due to inclement weather nor provide complete information about safe havens or alternate routes for trucks and sidings for rail. On June 12, 1994, Mineral County had an earthquake with a 6.0 magnitude (extracted from an "Earthquakes in NV 1852-1996" map/chart for the NV Bureau of Mines & Geology by UNR Seismological Lab.) Even if Yucca Mountain would withstand a strong earthquake, what is being done to protect the transport of the high-level nuclear waste during earthquakes, hurricanes, tornados, etc.? []

12

[] Mineral County wants it put on record that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate with regard to addressing transportation. The DEIS should provide feasibility studies and impacts; and a comprehensive and thorough analysis of modes, specific routes, and emergency procedures in case a radioactive accident or natural disaster should occur. Transporting highly radioactive waste through 43 states (possibly affecting about 53 million people within one/half mile of the routes) is not prudent and would endanger the public and environment along these routes.

13

2. [] The cost of clean up at the Nevada Test Site, cost to build new routes (rail or roads), cost to ensure precautions are being taken, cost to train emergency response staff, and cost to clean up a radioactive accident would probably far exceed finding alternative ways to reuse this radioactive waste. The EIS has an inadequate analysis of the costs. It should include analysis of the eventuality of the waste at Yucca Mountain; and funds to monitor it, costs of drip shields, back fill, leaks and repair. []

14

3. [] Mineral County wants it put on record that a "health assessment" (at the cost of DOE) should be done now of all 10 affected counties. This assessment would reflect what is out there now. By showing the present health situations now, a case may be made for *not* adding to a potential number of latent cancer fatalities, and for documenting current health conditions prior to a radioactive waste accident. []

15

4. [] Mineral County believes that the radioactive waste should not be buried because there is no way mankind can predict what will happen in the future. Alternative ways should be studied so technology can find a way to reuse this radioactive waste. Burying something as deadly as radioactive waste does not solve any problems. If anything it might create more problems. []

Mineral County will be submitting additional comments by the Feb 9th comment deadline.

Judith A. Shankle, Nuclear Projects Office
Mineral County AULG Representative
Hawthorne, NV 89415
(775) 945-2484/2485

(2)




Figure S-10. Commercial and DOE sites and Yucca Mountain in relation to the U.S. Interstate Highway System.