

NOV 04 1999

8 MS. SHANKLE: I'm Judy Shankle from Mineral County.
9 I'm one of the AULG representatives, and my statement today
10 is basically general, but I will be submitting more
11 involved and detailed statements.

1 [12 Mineral County does not agree that: (a) The
13 radioactive waste should be buried, because there's no way
14 mankind can predict what will happen in the future.
15 Alternative ways should be studied so technology can find a
16 way to reuse this radioactive waste. Burying something as
17 deadly as radioactive waste does not solve any problems.
18 If anything, it might create more problems.]

2 19 (b) [Transporting highly radioactive waste in
20 43 states is -- it does not agree that it's prudent. Why
21 would anyone want to endanger the public and environment
22 along these routes? A no-action scenario provided by the
23 Department of Energy indicated that the figures of possible
24 latent fatalities would be the same or less than burying
25 the radioactive waste at a repository.] And I did attach a

1 sample of that.

3 2 | America, be it rural or urban, is not ready
3 to handle the transportation of spent nuclear fuel or
4 high-level radioactive waste of this magnitude. The rural
5 areas do not have: (a) Good or safe roads to transport this
6 nuclear waste, especially if alternative routes are
7 selected; (b) Railroads to get it to Yucca Mountain; (c)
7 8 | The necessary equipment nor trained personnel to act upon a
9 radioactive accident; (d) Money to handle a radioactive
10 accident and support its own county. |

4... 11 | The cost to ensure that the rural areas
12 would be able to transport the radioactive waste would
13 probably exceed the no-action alternative. Urban areas are
14 too populated to transport it through and around.

15 Taking care of the radioactivity exposed
16 would be costly. Finding alternative ways, although costly
17 initially, would probably be less costly in the long run
18 for two reasons: (1) The money that the commercial
19 reactors set aside could pay for most of the cost; and, (2)
20 When new uses are found, new money would be brought in and
21 eventually the alternative pays for itself.

22 Finally, the cost of cleanup at the nuclear
23 test site; cost to build new routes, rail or roads; and
24 cost to clean up a radioactive accident would probably far
25 exceed finding alternative ways to reuse this radioactive



4 cont. 1 waste. |
5 2 | Mineral County wants it put on record that a
3 health assessment should be done of all the affected
4 counties. This assessment would reflect what is out there
5 now. By showing the present health situations now, a case
6 may be made for not adding to the potential number of
7 latent cancer fatalities. |

6 8 | Mineral County would like to have a separate
9 standard for transporting of radioactive waste.
10 Transporting highly radioactive waste in 43 states,
11 possibly affecting 53 million people, is not prudent. | Why
12 would anyone want to endanger the public and environment
13 along these routes?

14 MR. SKIPPER: Thank you for your comments.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Thanks very much.

16 Our next speaker is Steven Kalish.