

HC 66 Box 11056  
Pahrump, NV 89060  
(775) 372-5400  
July 4, 2001

RECEIVED

010319

JUL 11 2001

To: U. S. Department of Energy  
From: Andrea D. Greene

Comments Regarding the Supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

1 Before remarking "within scope" to the abovementioned document, I wish to again state that I am  
not only totally opposed to the absurd concept of Yucca Mountain ever being able to serve as a  
2 "safe" repository for spent nuclear fuel, but that I am also of the opinion that we, as a species,  
made a grave error when we "split the atom", and that the only way to halt the madness is to do  
just that - halt the madness. We should not make any more nuclear waste, and we should keep  
and guard what we have made as close to its origin as possible and then work like crazy to figure  
out ways to render it less dangerous and in the meantime we should work like crazy to figure out  
clean methods of producing energy. Just think how far along that road we would be if some of the  
money spent on trying to ramrod Yucca Mountain through in order to please the nuclear power  
industry had been spent on those two alternative enterprises.

Points in Question on the Supplement to the DEIS:

- 3 1. The NRC is going to require that the DOE prove ownership of Yucca Mountain before they can  
use it as a disposal site; though they obviously "control" it, the Western Shoshone Nation owns it  
and they oppose the project. To state that they will get "permanent control" is by no means  
assured. They will most assuredly not, if "people power" can have anything to do with it.
- 4 2. The questions raised with regard to the DEIS concerning employment and population figures in  
Nye County and the transportation of waste through Nevada and throughout the U.S. has not been  
addressed adequately in the Supplement.
- 5 3. The questions regarding the movement of groundwater have not been adequately addressed,  
6 nor have concerns regarding the movement of water above ground during heavy rainstorms. This  
concern relates to dangerous materials being picked up from substances stored above ground and  
underground and being carried all over and under the Amargosa Valley and into Death Valley.
- 7 4. The questions of the effects of possible volcanic action, and especially earthquake action in  
both the near and the far future, are not dealt with adequately. Indeed, the risks with regard to  
these dangers seem likely, even to a non-scientist.
- 8 5. The designs for this whole project, which could not be "finalized" in the DEIS, and seem to be in  
an even greater state of flux in the Supplement, show no promise of ever standing still long enough  
to really be analyzed for the potential danger of these wastes to humanity and the environment if  
things don't work out the way the DOE hopes they will.

(Page 2)

- 9 6. An extremely important point regards the establishment of "radiation emission regulations", which have not been finalized. The Supplement is willing to speak about less rigorous standards as if they in fact were mandated by law.
- 10 7. The idea of an aboveground storage pad for materials so that they can "cool off" for about 50 years is terrifying. Is this really a good idea? (My husband and I live in Crystal, Nevada, just across the road from Yucca Mountain. I can really "picture" that one in both my imagination and my nightmares.)
- 11 8. The idea of "resorting" waste is also a scary idea, considering the fact that it has never been done before, and that it would involve many opportunities for error arising from possible faulty record keeping and spent fuel originating from so many different sites.
- 12 9. The addition of a huge storage pool presents problems with regard to both the risk of  
13 earthquake damage, and with regard to where the water would come from for the purpose and where it would go after it was ready to be "gotten rid of".
- 14 10. The fact that the DEIS offered no alternatives (a violation of NEPA) to the Yucca Mountain site and that a "no action" alternative appears to be a "non-option" is not ameliorated in the Supplement.
- 15 11. In general, I object to the haste with which the Supplement to the DEIS is being rushed through the process of public comment, and the limited locations where hearings have been held. This is an issue which impacts our entire country. Indeed, it impacts our entire globe and countless future generations. We, as citizens with only laymen's knowledge, cannot really combat the glitzy slick "scientific" public relations campaign designed to make us all feel as if we are in safe hands, but we should at least be given time and enough information to try.
- 16 I have written to some of my elected leaders demanding that the site recommendation hearings NOT be held until AFTER the final EIS is published. I am again stating that, if this should occur, I feel it is the completely unfair and the wrong order for the process to occur in.

Respectfully submitted by



Andrea D. Greene  
HC 66 - Box 11056  
Pahrump, NV 89060  
July 4, 2001