



webserver@yucca-web2.ymp.gov on 02/22/2000 09:47:45 AM

To: EISRYM/RWDOE
cc:

RECEIVED

FEB 22 2000

Subject: EIS Comment

February 22, 2000 09:47:45

IP address: 204.213.252.151

The Commentors Name:

--->Mr. Edward V Paul

The Commentors Address:

--->1210-6 Clements Bridge Rd
--->Barrington, New Jersey 08007

Email Information:

--->
---> Add commentor to the mailing list : on

Contact Information:

---> fax number :
---> phone number :
---> organization :
---> position :

Comment Text :

1 -->? Accessibility. The DEIS constantly buries the reader in a jumble of
confusing cross-references and redundancies. This obfuscation makes it
difficult-if not impossible-for interested parties to navigate the
three-volume report and to provide specific and clear comments to the
DOE regarding the improvement of the DEIS.

2 ? Transportation. The DEIS should clearly and accurately characterize
the risks involved along the transportation routes, and it should use
3 the most current information available to do so. Further, it should
include site-specific data to show the effects of accidents in highly
populated areas or areas where it would be difficult to retrieve a
4 leaking cask (such as ravines and rivers) or where accidents might be
more likely because of extreme weather, steep inclines, or sharp
curves. The DEIS should also note which mode of transportation the DOE
prefers-rail or truck.

5 ? Transportation. The DEIS fails to address the fact that the number of
shipments and the amount of radioactive material that will be shipped
is unprecedented in world history. About 90% of the volume would be
spent fuel from nuclear power plants, and virtually none of this type
of material has ever been shipped before. The DOE has posted the routes
it used to complete the DEIS on its web site. This is a good start, but
this information should be included in the DEIS. The DEIS should
include both maps and tables showing the routes and number of shipments
expected on each route, as well as where the waste shipped on each
route will originate, and how many casks will be involved (especially
for rail shipments).

6 ? Emergency Preparedness. The DEIS does not examine what emergency
response personnel training and equipment would be needed in all of the

6 cont, communities along the transportation routes and what the specific impacts of a transportation accident would be. Many local communities lack the special equipment and training necessary to respond to a radiological accident. Further, many hospitals do not have isolation rooms for radioactively contaminated victims. This analysis should at least be done for the major population centers along the transportation routes (populations of 100,000 or more). The DEIS should indicate what emergency response equipment, facilities, and trained personnel are available in these communities, and what the effects of a transportation accident could be based on what is currently available.]

7 ? Environmental Justice. [The DOE approached its environmental justice analysis by first reviewing the proposed action to see if it would likely result in high and adverse human health or environmental impacts to the general population, and then supposedly checking to see if any identified impacts would disproportionately affect specific minority or low-income communities. With this method, the DOE was unable to identify any environmental justice issues. It seems that in order to achieve true environmental justice, the DOE would need to identify all of the minority and low-income communities that could potentially be affected and then check to see if there would be any negative impacts to these communities that would be disproportionate to other communities.]
