

EIS001037

Testimony for  
The U.S. Department of Energy's Hearing on the Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
St. Louis, Missouri  
January 20, 2000

RECEIVED

JAN 20 2000

by  
William H. Miller  
Professor of Nuclear Engineering  
University of Missouri-Columbia  
Licensed Professional Engineer (Missouri)  
Certified Health Physicist  
E2433 Engineering Building East  
University of Missouri  
Columbia, Missouri 65211

1... I encourage the timely completion of the Yucca Mountain site for the disposal of spent nuclear fuel. As stated in the Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement, "a central repository is far safer than having spent fuel stored at 72 commercial sites and 5 U.S.D.O.E. sites in 36 states," and I concur with this statement. I also encourage the continued development of a safe transportation system, based upon a significant history of shipping technology and actual nuclear material transport, to move the fuel from these nuclear reactors to Yucca Mountain.

Some may suggest that I have a vested interest in my support of Yucca Mountain, and it is true that I do. My family and I live exactly 1 1/4 miles from Interstate 70 and I work 1 1/2 miles from Interstate 70. Thus, I probably spend more time in close proximity to one of the possible major routes for spent nuclear fuel than anyone else that has testified here today. Mine is not a casual or a biased opinion concerning the ultimate disposal of nuclear fuel.

2 However, I have seen the crash test films of trucks and trains containing spent fuel casks being slammed into solid concrete walls at 80 mph and know that, even if an accident might happen, no nuclear material will be released to the environment. My favorite video, which I show routinely to my students, is that of the British cask crash tests where a cask was run over by a train at 100 mph and watched by 1500 invited media and guests. The cask was not breached. I am also aware of the planning required by local, state and federal officials for these shipments, the training requirements for shippers and emergency personnel, and of the continuous communications, satellite positioning sensors and escorts required for shipping vehicles. I am aware that over 3000 shipments of spent nuclear fuel have already occurred in the U.S. over the past 30 years with safety.

4 My concern is that some see opposition to Yucca Mountain as a way to shutdown nuclear power plants. The National Academy of Science issued a new report on global warming just within the last month that states "the warming trend in global-mean surface temperature observations during the past 20 years is undoubtedly real and substantially greater than the average rate of warming during the twentieth century." Nuclear power emits no greenhouse gases that can contribute to this effect. It also contributes an important 20% to the electrical generation mix in this country. (It is interesting to note that even if nuclear power plants were shutdown today, the spent nuclear fuel generated to date would still need to be moved to a permanent location.)

1 cont. My concern is that \$17 billion dollars has already been collected from ratepayers like myself and less than one-half of this has actually been appropriated for the program at Yucca Mountain. Thus, the program is at least 12 years behind schedule.

I encourage the timely completion of this disposal process so that spent nuclear fuel can be safely transported and stored in a consolidated location.

Thank you for your time.