

Celeste Roberts  
P.O. Box 8752  
Maumee, OH. 43537

Monday January 31, 2000

RECEIVED  
FEB 07 2000

Wendy R. Dixon, EIS Project Manager  
Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office  
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management  
U.S. Department of Energy  
P.O. Box 30307, M/S 010  
North Las Vegas, Nevada 89036-0307

**EIS001198**

QUESTIONS / COMMENTS REGARDING THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN DRAFT EIS:

Hello, my name is Celeste Roberts. I am a resident of Northwest Ohio, a U.S. citizen and a registered voter. Thank you for this opportunity to offer my input to the Department of Energy's decision making process on your suggested solution to the problem of safely disposing the existing nuclear waste in our country.

At the evening hearings in Cleveland on Friday January 28, 2000 I became more informed and familiar with the DOE Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a geologic repository for the disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) and High-Level Radioactive Waste (HLRW) at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada. I learned of specific details through the fourteen-page handout provided, hour-long presentation, half-hour question/answer period and half-hour comment period. Although I am glad that I attended the hearings, I am more concerned, not less, about the permanent ramification of your proposal.

- 1 I understand that the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA) requires a technically adequate and final EIS to accompany a site recommendation and license application which can be adopted, to the extent practicable, by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). What is the definition of "technically adequate"?
- 2 I am not comfortable with the \$30 Billion dollar DOE proposal to gather our country's 70,000 Metric Tons  
3 of Heavy Metal (MTHM), store it in a centralized location, and then abandon it prematurely. Transporting SNF and HLRW on U.S. highways and railroads raises serious health and safety concerns indeed for every American in its' path. No matter what number of expected transportation accidents is calculated, one death is too many. The option of doing nothing is not acceptable either, inaction will also cause harm.
- 4 In the outline of the emergency response training required, it appears that much uniformity will result from the DOE's plans to place that responsibility on each state individually. I don't believe it is possible for any fire department or response team to be prepared for an accident involving two casks of nuclear waste, there are too many things that could go wrong. Would clean-ups be paid for with national disaster funds?
- 5 Abandoning the nuclear waste in place does not seem like a good idea considering the close proximity to the populous that created it, however it does seem more appropriate than endangering larger numbers of us by transporting it through each of our neighborhoods. An option to the two alternatives offered by the DOE should be to require the waste producers to maintain permanent proper containment within their own states. 10,000 years is only a fraction of the half-life, engineering controls should be implemented for the duration of the risk period. The waste producers, not the taxpayers, should be liable for the cost of the containment.
- 6 Although other countries may be digging holes, burying their waste and forgetting it, we the people of the United States need to set a better example and not follow the apathetic trails of that careless mindset. Our decisions will have longer than long-term effects . . . tens of thousands of years , oh my !

Please do not recommend Yucca Mountain as a nuclear waste repository to the President.