

FAX COVER SHEET

EIS000007

RECEIVED
AUG 17 1999

Thursday, August 12, 1999 08:50:19 AM

To: Yucca DEIS
At: USDOE
Fax #: 1 800 967 0739

Fax: 1 page and a cover page.

EIS000007

RECEIVED
AUG 17 1999

To: Ms Wendy R Dixon
US DOE M/S 010
OCRWM
Yucca Mtn Site Office
POB 30307
N Las Vegas, NV 89036-0307
800 967 0739

From: Marvin Lewis
3133 Fairfield St.
Phila PA 19136

Re: Comments on Draft EIS For Yucca Mtn Radioactive
Waste Site

1. I appreciate the Fax number and it makes commenting much easier.
2. I respectfully request that the article in the N Y Times Science Section at Page F1 on Tuesday, August 10, 1999, be added as a reference to these comments. "New Questions Plague Nuclear Waste Storage Plan."
3. The Draft EIS is a disappointment. Instead of looking at the problems of the geological repository, the draft looks at the problems of a 'no action' alternative

Example: S.5.2.3 The No Action Alternative assumes the risk of intruder sabotage only for 77 sites. The Yucca Mtn alternative assumes little chance if any of intruder sabotage.

These assumptions fly in the face of reasonable analysis. The wastes would be most at risk in transport. Let's take the case of Philadelphia, PA.

a. During the Oil Blocade of the early 70's when the entire Nation was suffering from an oil shortage, two oil tankers hit head on under the 30th st Overpass putting two superhighways out of use for weeks.

b. When Limerick bought partially used nuclear fuel from a closed Long Island and nuclear power plant that closed after a few months, that fuel had to be barged to Phila, off loaded to a train, and passed thru the City thru a horse shoe curve under the Art Museum and residences, a cite of many accidents.

These are the kind of risks in transportation that statistics allow DOE manipulators to overlook!

4. Throughout this Draft, risks are overlooked, minimized, and just plain ignored where convenient to promote the use of Yucca Mtn.
5. No Action is not the only viable alternative. Finding an adequate site and doing an adequate job of assessment is the preferred alternative.
6. I suggest an alternative: Find an adequate site that does not have an active fault like the Ghost Dance Fault going thru the center of it.
7. The comments above are not comprehensive. The Draft EIS and the Yucca Mtn site have many deficiencies which I have neither the time nor inclination to expound.

Respectfully submitted,
Marvin I. Lewis
<marulewis@juno.com>