



Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste

Comment Sheet

RECEIVED

JAN 25 2000

Name: Jeanette Helge Organization: N/A EIS000956
 Mailing Address: 400 Calonele Run
Clarksville, La. Zip: 30523
 Telephone number (optional): ()

How did you hear about us?

Newspaper ad

Public meetings

Other: E-mail - WARD

Neighbor

News coverage

If you want to be on our mailing list to receive information about the Environmental Impact Statement or site characterization, check here.

Comments: (If possible, please reference section number and/or page number in document if applicable.)

1 I would not have known about this "public hearing" had it not been for e-mail I received. Since this was called a "public hearing" that can impact an important decision why wasn't this broadcast over the news both TV & Radio so American families would know about it & could make arrangements for their voices to be heard or maybe the meeting could have been held on a weekend.

2 I am very much against Yucca Mountain being the disposal site for high level nuclear waste for reasons I have attached to this Comment Sheet I obtained at the meeting.

3... I feel the answer to our energy problems lie in solar, wind & hydrogen energy. We in this country have the means to accomplish this. We just need to get greed out of the picture & a sincere desire to clean up the environment for our future and the earth.

Please note: For your comment(s) to be considered in the Final Environmental Impact Statement, your comment(s) need to be received by the Department of Energy by February 9, 2000. To the extent practicable the Department will consider comments received after February 9.

Please feel free to attach additional pages; more postage may be needed. If you prefer to mail your comments, you may use the back side of this sheet as a postage-paid, self-mailer. To do so, fold in thirds along the dotted line so address and postage-paid notice are visible; then secure with tape. ①

Page 2 of COMMENT SHEET

Below are reasons I am AGAINST disposal of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain:

- 4 1. The term "disposal" cannot apply to materials that will remain hazardous virtually forever. Recognizing Earth as a constantly changing, dynamic system, there is no place where one can confidently predict that if we were to place the high-level waste in a hole, it would remain isolated. Within the last 10,000 years a volcano near Yucca Mountain erupted.
- 5 2. This site should be rejected as unsuitable since it is classified in the highest risk category for earthquakes. Further, it will not retain radioactive gases, such as Carbon-14 and thus cannot meet the original repository standards set by the EPA. IT ALSO SITS ON TOP OF A MAJOR AQUIFER SHARED BY A NEARBY FARMING COMMUNITY, INCLUDING A LARGE DAIRY, SERVING LOS ANGELES MARKETS.
- 6... 3. According to the Energy Policy Act of 1992, the NRC has no legal authority to usurp EPA's legally mandated jurisdiction to set radiation release, public health, and environmental protection standards for the proposed Yucca Mountain repository.
- 7 4. Water quality must be protected to the fullest extent of the law, which this proposed NRC rule fails to do. Yucca Mountain should have the most stringent of standards, for leakage will only increase over time. Such stringent standards would guard against an unsafe location being licensed for the repository.
- 8 5. Nevadans living near the proposed Yucca Mountain repository need to be more protected from radioactive contamination of their water supply than New Mexicans living near WIPP because for one reason, Nevadans are also exposed to radioactivity from two other sources: the Nevada Test Site, and the Beatty "low level" radioactive waste dump. The NRC rule proposes a lesser standard of protection for Yucca Mountain releases than for those of WIPP, and this fact is entirely unacceptable. This NRC proposed rule does not assure adequate protection for future generations of people who would be exposed to radionuclide releases from the proposed Yucca Mountain repository.
- 9... 6. Over 100,000 shipments of high level nuclear waste, en route to Yucca Mountain, NV will travel continuously for 30 YEARS across 43 states within $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of 52 million American homes. The DOE acknowledges that we can expect an average of 15 accidents per year.

9 cont. 7. Accidents will happen. A DOE Environmental Assessment
 10 warns that an accident scenario involving high speed
 impact would contaminate a 42 square mile area, require
 462 days to clean up, and cost \$620 million. Also the
 11 casks are only built to withstand a crash of 30mph and
 have NEVER BEEN TESTED. Each large canister would hold
 the long-lived radiological equivalent of 200 Hiroshima
 bombs. Under the DOE's current plan, the transportation
 program will be privatized and NEITHER DOE nor the
 CONTRACTORS will be LIABLE for any problems. WE, as
 TAXPAYERS, will pay any settlement in the wake of an
 accident, or from the loss of property value.

6 cont. In conclusion, despite the complexity and decades long process
 involved with the Yucca Mountain repository proposal, the NRC
 rule would weaken or undo the requirement that DOE systematically
 record its decisions that significantly concern safety, how those
 decisions were made, and what factors influenced them. Given the
 grave consequences of radiation leakage from a repository, systematic
 accountability on scientific and engineering decisions related to
 safety must be upheld.

With these considerations in mind, I reiterate my strong opinion
 that the NRC's proposed rule should be withdrawn until EPA
 promulgates standards, at which time NRC can then modify its
 repository licensing rule to meet the EPA standards, as required
 by law. By withdrawing its proposed rule, the NRC can demonstrate
 its commitment to the health of our communities.

3 cont. As mentioned before, I feel the answer to our energy problems lie
 in solar, wind and hydrogen energy and this country has the means
 to accomplish this. The population of this country is increasing,
 land is not. Where are we going to continue to bury spent nuclear
 fuel and high-level radioactive waste in the future?

Thank you for the opportunity to express my comments.

Jeanette Hellgeth