



WOMEN'S ACTION FOR NEW DIRECTIONS EDUCATION FUND

NATIONAL OFFICE: 691 Massachusetts Ave., Arlington, MA 02476 (781) 643-4880 fax (781) 643-6744 e-mail info@wand.org
 DC OFFICE: Suite 205, 110 Maryland Avenue N.E., Wash, DC 20002 (202) 543-8505 fax (202) 675-6469 e-mail wand@wand.org
 WAND FIELD OFFICE: 139 Candler Oaks Lane, Decatur, GA 30030 (404) 370-0448 fax (404) 370-0491 e-mail membership@wand.org

FOUNDER

Helen Caldicott, M.D.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Rep. Kathryn Bowers, TN

President

Sayre Sheldon, MA

President Emerita

Sen. Jean Ankeney, VT

Sen. Mary Cathcart, ME

Patricia Ellsberg, CA

Jean Gordon, AR

Rep. June Hegstrom, GA

Hon. Barbara Hildt, MA

Rep. Barbara Mobley, GA

Rep. Kitty Piercy, OR

Hon. Leni Sitnick, NC

Karen Speros, CA

Carlotta Tyler, MA

Arlene Victor, MI

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Susan Shaer

ADVISORY BOARD

Diane D. Aronson

Rev. Dorothy A. Austin, Th.D.

T. Berry Brazelton, M.D.

Betty Bumpers

Margaret Burnham

Dagmar I. Celeste

Diane V. Cirincione

Susan Clark

Elizabeth M. Dunn

Sally Field

Randall Forsberg

Carol Gilligan

Carla B. Johnston

Alan F. Kay

Jean Kilbourne

Pat Kingsley

Florence C. Ladd

Barbara Levin

Jean Baker Miller, M.D.

Ellen M. Poss, M.D.

Hon. Claudine Schneider

Linda Smith

Pam Solo

Janet L. Surrey, Ph.D.

Sheila Tobias, Ph.D.

Lily Tomlin

Carolyn Tribe

Vivienne Verdon-Roe

RECEIVED

OCT 21 1999

**Testimony on the Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement
 Georgia International Convention Center
 Atlanta, GA
 Thursday October 21, 1999**

Good afternoon. My name is Pat Ortmeyer, I'm the Field Director for Nuclear Waste Issues with WAND: Women's Action for New Directions. We want to thank you for holding these hearings today in Atlanta – it is crucial that *all* who are affected by the Yucca Mountain repository program have the opportunity learn about and comment on this proposal.

WAND has for many years focused on issues related to environmental contamination at US Department of Energy nuclear weapons facilities. We are also working on issues related to the Department's surplus military plutonium disposition program. As currently conceived by the Department, both the clean-up of the weapons complex and the effort to dispose of surplus weapons plutonium depend in part on the existence of an appropriate deep geologic repository to contain the waste.

1 While the need to isolate high-level nuclear waste from the environment is paramount, Yucca Mountain does not provide what is necessary to achieve that goal. The legislative mandate for the Yucca Mountain program directs that a *geologic* disposal site be selected. This is based on the logic that because we cannot engineer with confidence a means of containing nuclear waste for the hundreds of thousands of years for which it will remain hazardous, it is better to ensure it can be contained by other means – namely, stable geologic structures that could contain the waste even if the engineered barriers were to fail.

This concept has been turned on its head with the Yucca Mountain proposal as it currently stands. As studies on Yucca Mountain have been conducted over the years, serious problems have been found, such as the seepage of surface water into the site along fracture lines, a high level of seismic activity in the area, and the possibility of the uprising of hot water into the site from below.

2... Given such findings, the Department itself is clear that the Yucca Mountain site cannot be depended upon to contain the waste. But rather than abandon the site, it set out to design the undesignable: a container that can guarantee it will isolate the waste for as long as it remains hazardous. It is impossible for the Department -- regardless of what new technology or alloy may be invented -- to certify that an engineered container will hold up over the hundreds of thousands of years necessary to protect the environment and the public from releases from the site.



2 cont. If we now accept that we must rely upon engineered barriers to contain the waste, then this program needs to be scrapped and redesigned from the bottom up. Yucca Mountain could not be said to have any distinct geologic advantage over any other site. There is a real possibility that *no* proposed geologic site in the United States would be able to meet the fundamental requirements for waste containment.

6 Faced with this, at the very least, we must reexamine the fact that we continue to rely on nuclear power as an energy source, which produces waste for which there is no means of safe disposal.

3 But for existing waste we must find better storage, management, and disposal methods, and we challenge the Department to continue to search for technologically and environmentally sound options that do not rely on compromises in order to work.

4 The failures of Yucca Mountain should be a loud signal to us that we cannot simply sweep nuclear waste under a carpet of volcanic tuff and hope it will go away. It will not go away. Those who know that most acutely are the Western Shoshone people, who claim Yucca Mountain as sacred land, and who will be the first people exposed when Yucca Mountain leaks.

5 The current Yucca Mountain program, as outlined in the DEIS, balances on an absurd tower of lies, poor science, lack of caring, self-deception, and an advanced case of "Wishing will make it so." Wishing will not turn Yucca Mountain into a suitable geologic repository. We can weaken standards, change the rules, lower the bar, or look the other way, but for our security and the security of thousands of generations to come, we are far better served by abandoning Yucca Mountain as a high level waste repository, ceasing the production of more high-level waste, and applying our best science and deepest caring to finding a better way.

Pat Ortmeier
Field Director for Nuclear Waste Issues
Women's Action for New Directions