

JAN 13 2000

1 MR. ANDRUS: I'm Calvin Andrus, Calvin Nielson Andrus. I'm the president of Analogics  
 continued below Marketing and Consulting and a professor of business and economics at West Port University. I'm in  
 2 support of the conclusions of the draft environmental study, and I am in support of the posthaste  
 continued below development of the storage facility at Yucca Mountain.

1 The draft environmental impact study supported the view that this is a reasonable and a responsible  
 continued solution to our problems. I'm continually amazed at how as a people, as a society we misplace emphasis. It  
 3 seems to me that many of the objections to the Yucca Mountain repository are totally misplaced. If we were  
 continued below as concerned about human safety as we appear to be, why wouldn't we be more concerned about heart  
 disease or malaria, which is a global problem, than the storage of nuclear materials at this particular site in  
 Nevada.

If we were truly concerned about the safety of the populace, why wouldn't we be more concerned, I  
 emphasize more, about light rail, for instance? It's been shown in this very community to which I have  
 belonged for some 25 years that in this community light rail will kill more people on an annual basis than  
 the entire 24 years of transportation of nuclear materials to the site. In other words, why all this public  
 emphasis on safety in connection with this particular program as opposed to the very issues we face in our  
 own community? I don't understand this.

I deal with industry all of the time, and we continually rank order problems. If you've got a leak in  
 the bottom of a bucket, you patch the big hole first. You don't worry about the pinholes until later, but you  
 concentrate on the big holes first.

3 Well, in this particular case I'm astounded by the fact that we're concerned about the release of  
 continued radiation from the site when in our very own state, the state of Utah, we have the Intermountain Power  
 Project which on a daily basis is releasing anywhere from two to ten pounds of radioactive material into the  
 atmosphere. Now, where is the consistency? Here we have a light rail system that will kill probably as  
 many people on an annual basis as in the remote possibility in 24 years. And in fact, the probabilities are  
 that it's many more times probable that we will die from a meteor impact than a fatality associated with  
 anything to do with the transportation of nuclear waste to the Yucca Mountain facility. It's far more  
 probable that we will suffer some type of radiological damage from the uranics, the granitic formations here  
 in the canyon than the transportation of these materials to Yucca Mountain facility. In other words, where is  
 the consistency? Where's the balance? Where's the reasonableness, if you're concerned.

2 The industry supports the findings of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that building this  
 continued on page 2 repository makes a lot of sense. It's the most positive, effective solution we have at the present time. If we  
 were to compare the cost to the coal industry, somebody made that point earlier, to the coal industry, the  
 amount of death and devastation in our own state is hundreds of times greater. We've lost more in the  
 Huntington Canyon disaster than we would reasonably expect in the entire duration, even projecting  
 hundreds of years into the future, for the repository.

4 I'm not sure we have all the technological answers. I think we need to maintain an open perspective  
 on what a final solution might be. A deep sea repository in oolitic oozes at the bottom of the Marionis  
 Trench seems to make as much sense as storing it in a facility here, were it not for the fact that we have  
 tremendous political usage faced with the storage in an area that doesn't have -- related to it. There's a lot of  
 political problems with any solution.

But whatever the technological solutions are, we need to maintain an open -- One of the things that  
 I've personally been involved with is the nuclear transportation. We've been able to take a certain amount of  
 thorium and subject it to charged clusters. These are toroed-shaped (phonetic) clusters consisting of about

ten to the ninth electrons, and we've been able to reduce, for all we can tell, thorium into non-nuclear elements.

Now, if I can do that in the laboratory with household current, 110 volt, and I'm still here, then we have some technical solutions. I say "still here" because the amount that we were eliminating would have been roughly equivalent to about four cases of TNT. I shouldn't be here.

5

What I'm telling you is that there is the hope of technical solutions for the ultimate reduction of these high-level nuclear wastes, and I think nuclear transportation is one of those.

Building a repository is the environmentally responsible thing to do. How is it that we're being environmentally responsible by damming our rivers and producing pollution in our own state and not being responsible by creating a repository? You see what I'm saying? Why is it that one is responsible and the other is not? I think we have some serious reconsideration of our priorities.

2  
continued

The draft EIS makes it clear that the energy department must move forward now with the Yucca Mountain project. We need to meet the obligations that we have to come up with a solution to the nuclear fuel. It accounts for 20 percent of our energy; 20 percent of our energy is derived from nuclear. And there's a direct correspondence between our GNP and the expenditure in use of, consumption of electrical power -- energy.

As one of the, as one of the people who does some consulting in the field of household energy for one of the state's energy auditors licensed under the NCSBCS, National Council of States on Building Code Standards. If we were truly serious about the issues associated with energy, why wouldn't we start with conservation? That would seem to have a more immediate impact than some of the other issues to which we've been exposed here today.

2  
continued

So in summation I'd like to just make this final point. Most of the objections I've heard in association with the Yucca Mountain repository are wildly inconsistent with the hazards and problems we face on a routine basis. In other words, why not start with big issues first? This is not a big issue. Let's get on with the repository. It's the best solution we have at the present time. Let's make this solution work.