

RECEIVED

010158

JUN 07 2001

PIPER WEINBERG: My name is Piper Weinberg, W-e-i-n-b-e-r-g. Thank you for not aligning me with Casper Weinberger last time. That's good.

1 I noticed that -- well, first of all, I'd like to thank the DOE for making this or for hosting this session or this meeting in a more public place than a casino. I think echoing what Kalynda said and what Willie said it's really good to bring the DOE and the hearings into the community as well as trying to bring the community in. It's got to go both ways, and that there is a call for having more hearings throughout the nation and throughout Nevada.

2 I was just noticing that everyone who has spoken here today, correct me if I'm wrong, is spoken in opposition to Yucca Mountain, and I think that's an important thing to notice. And also that most people are requesting a 45-day extension, and I think since this design is evolving continually that our comments and that hearings should be continual as well. I don't see any reason why not. If there's going to be constantly new designs cropping up, we're going to have to be constantly commenting on them.

3 So I think the SDEIS first talked about the proposed Yucca Mountain project, and again the official pose is even though they're constantly working on it, that a lot of it is irresponsible. That it's the DOE's responsibility to incorporate the public comments and that they have been making comments for the DEIS just throughout the whole process. There's a lot of comments that were made, but we don't hear back from them at all about them and any responses, and there isn't any mention of them in supplements.

4... Obviously there's opposition to the project here, and various alternatives have been presented throughout the years and have been presented tonight. But the SDEIS discredits and disrespects these views because any alternative plan kind of tucks them away, doesn't present them in supplements, in documents, or it presents them as a short statement on the bottom of the page.

For example, this is something that I talked about in Las Vegas but really frustrates me so I keep bringing it up. On the bottom of page S-5 there's a table, and in other places in the document. It says, quote, Opposing Native American viewpoints, end quote. Simply writing a phrase I don't think is sufficient, and it doesn't acknowledge and consider the federal government's historic century-old process of disenfranchising Native American lives and voices, a process known as cultural genocide.

This SDEIS furthers the program's cultural genocide, the way I see it. The opposing Native American viewpoint shouldn't just be restricted to the section that the federal government mandates the DOE to actually consider. It's kind of like the government, this mom telling the kid to apologize, and then the kid apologizes for this one instance. And I think that's insufficient, to say the least. I think it's disrespectful.

4 cont. So just because the President wrote an order, an Executive Order for the environmental justice issue to be noted, it should be more than noted. It should follow through.

And as Pauline mentioned, this land has been used, you know, since time immemorial by the Western Shoshone Nation. And to discredit their comments and just kind of shelve it and have it be something on the periphery of this decision and of this process is again shameful. |

5 So | I think most significantly the opposing, the so-called, you know, little, between the parenthesis, Opposing Native American Viewpoint, should introduce any kind of Supplement. It should be most importantly the Land Use and Ownership section, since this land is slated for the use of a repository the Western Shoshone Nation holds title to it, according to the 1863 Treaty of Ruby Valley, again as Pauline said. And I think democracy here means that people need to voice their opinions and not just that the opinions are heard, they need to follow through. |

6 | There other ways that the DEIS is insufficient. It doesn't fully present quantitatively or qualitatively the ecological footprint of the evolving design of all different grades and designs. They need to look at every way that it affects the land that the resources, the steel is coming from, the mining, the transportation of these resources and going down to the downwinders in the area, the plant and animal life, people who drink the water and the milk from this area. How is all that really going to affect them? What are the numbers? What are the cancer rates? How is that going to work? It doesn't. |

7 | As other people have said, the SDEIS doesn't present qualitative or quantitative studies of the various accident scenarios. Studies must be conducted and presented to the public. How would a crack in the fuel column, accidents along transportation routes, mislabeling, as people have said of packages, of the waste packages, how the Alloy 22, which is my age, how are all these things going to play out in the long run? |

8 And to wrap up, | I guess it seems like the SDEIS neglected to address the fact that as we speak the waste is piling up at reactors around this country. Six metric -- six million metric tons of toxic radioactive waste is being created per day. So is this design going to be continually evolving to incorporate the excess waste that's being created? Is this design going to have to evolve as Las Vegas is doing and as the Test Site continues to do as waste keeps coming in? |

9 | And I just think this SDEIS and people's responses to it make it clear that the project isn't viable, that there's an unnecessarily high risk of contamination and that, you know, that the public is opposed to this Yucca Mountain project. |