

RECEIVED

NOV 04 1999

EIS000383

Lone Pine, CA

11/4/99

Exhibit 1-1

STATEMENT of Judith Shankle

Mineral County's Statement to the Dept. of Energy for Yucca Mountain

1 (continues next page)

Mineral County does not agree that:

a. The radioactive waste should be buried because there is no way mankind can predict what will happen in the future. Alternative ways should be studied so technology can find a way to reuse this radioactive waste. Burying something as deadly as radioactive waste does not solve any problems. If anything it might create more problems.

2 b. Transporting highly radioactive waste through 43 states is <sup>not</sup> prudent. Why would anyone want to endanger the public and environment along these routes. A no-action scenario provided by the Department of Energy indicated that the figures of possible latent fatalities would be the same or less than burying the radioactive waste at a repository (see attachment A).

3 America, be it rural or urban is not ready to handle the transportation of Spent Nuclear Fuel or High-Level Radioactive Waste of this magnitude. The rural areas do not have:

- a. Good or safe roads to transport this nuclear waste, especially, if alternative routes are selected;
b. Railroads to get it to Yucca Mountain;

- 4 c. The necessary equipment, nor trained personnel to act upon a radioactive accident;
d. Money to handle a radioactive accident and support its own county.

5 The cost to ensure that the rural areas would be able to transport the radioactive waste, would probably exceed the no-action alternative. Urban areas are too populated to transport it through and around them.

Taking care of the radioactively exposed would be costly. Finding alternative ways although costly initially would probably be less costly in the long run for two reasons:

- 1. The money that the commercial reactors set aside could pay for most of the cost, and
2. When new uses are found, new money would be brought in and eventually the alternative pays for itself.

Finally, the cost of clean up at the Nevada Test Site, cost to build new routes (rail or roads), and cost to clean up a radioactive accident would probably far exceed finding alternative ways to reuse this radioactive waste.

(1)

Draft Yucca Mountain Environmental Impact Statement  
 Comparison of Proposed Action to No Action Alternatives  
 Total Fatalities Per Year  
 (derived from data in Table 2-7)

EIS000383

28

Alternative	0-24yrs.	24yr. Total	25-100yrs.	75yr. Total	100yr. Total	101-10,000yrs.	9,900yr. Total
Proposed	.75-2.69	18.70-67.13	.04-.06	3.01-4.53	21.70-71.66	5 X 10 <sup>-8</sup> -5.3 X 10 <sup>-8</sup>	5 X 10 <sup>-5</sup> -5.3 X 10 <sup>-4</sup>
No Action #1	.25	6.35	.25	19.06	25.4	.11	1,095
No Action #2	.25	6.35	.25	19.06	25.4	.33	3,300

Conclusions<sup>1</sup>

1. During the period 0-24 years Proposed Action is 3-10 times riskier than the No Action alternatives.
2. During the period 25-100 year No Action #1 is 4-6 times riskier than the Proposed Action
3. During the first 100 years Proposed Action is a little less to nearly three times riskier than No Action alternatives.
4. During the period 101 - 10,000 years No Action Alternative is 1,000 to 3,000 times riskier than the Proposed Action
5. During first 24 years of repository operation, transportation is the source of over 95 percent of all fatalities, with most being from highway accidents rather than exposure to radiation

1/ Proposed Action - disposal at Yucca Mountain

No Action Alternative #1 - on-site storage of wastes with long-term institutional controls

No Action Alternative #2 - on-site storage of wastes without long-term institutional controls

(ATTACHMENT A)

2