

DEC 01 1999

PUBLIC STATEMENT OF JUDITH SHANKLE

1 MS. SHANKLE: I'm Judy Shankle from Mineral
2 County, one of the affected units of local government
3 represented.

1 | 4 Mineral County believes that the radioactive
5 waste should not be buried because there's no way mankind
6 can predict what will happen in the future. Alternative
7 ways should be studied so technology can find a way to
8 reuse this radioactive waste.

9 Burying something as deadly as radioactive
10 waste does not solve any problems. If anything, it might
11 create more problems.

2 | 12 Transporting highly radioactive waste through
13 43 states is not prudent. Why would anyone want to
14 endanger the public and environment along these routes?

Repeated
Intro for 3-6

15 Mineral County believes that a number of
16 issues are not addressed properly, not addressed
17 adequately, or not addressed at all in the Draft EIS.

3... 18 These issues include but are not limited to: [impacts on
19 local government programs and costs. The DEIS does not
20 adequately address specific community, statewide and
21 regional impacts.]

17

22 [Rural counties do not have money to handle
23 radioactive accidents. The cost to insure that rural
24 counties would be able to accommodate the transportation
25 of the radioactive waste would probably exceed the no

1 action alternative.]

4

2 [Uncertainty in models and data used for site
3 characterization and repository performance.

4 cont'd.

4 Mineral County's flood plan map is incorrect.
5 If this is so, how reliable is the information gathered
6 for Yucca Mountain in other areas? The flood plain report
7 in the DEIS is too generalized. Mineral County would like
8 to have a detailed flood plain analysis done of Yucca
9 Mountain and each affected county.

5

10 Unreasonable no action alternatives. Two no
11 action alternatives were provided. One would have the
12 radioactive waste stay where it is under institutional
13 control for just 100 years. The second would have the
14 waste stay under institutional control for 10,000 years.

15 DOE acknowledges that neither is likely to
16 occur but says that other scenarios would be too
17 speculative. Mineral County would like to have reasonable
18 alternatives analyzed.

6

19 Cumulative impacts. Low level radioactive
20 waste shipments to and storage at the Nevada Test Site.

7

21 The DEIS provides a generic transportation analysis.
22 Specific transcontinental routes and communities along the
23 way are not identified. Other transportation issues of
24 the waste to the site are.

Repeated Intro
for 8-13

8

25 Mode. Not clearly identified. Three
1 possible modes of transportation are identified. The
2 waste could be driven on interstates using legal weight
3 trucks; it could be sent by train, which includes five
4 options of building a railroad to Yucca Mountain; it could
5 be transported by heavy-haul, which is rail to a transfer
6 point in Nevada, then transferred to 200-foot heavy-haul
7 trucks and transported to Yucca Mountain.

9

8 Routing. Many possible routes. None studied
9 adequately. Rural areas do not have good or safe roads to
10 transport this nuclear waste, especially if alternative
11 routes are selected. Nor do they have railroads to get it
12 to Yucca Mountain.

10

13 Land use consideration of present and planned
14 land uses along possible routes identified.

17 cont'd.

15 Emergency response. Training preparedness
16 and funding. Rural areas do not have necessary equipment
17 nor trained personnel to handle the radioactive accident.

11

18 Terrorists, extremist threat. DOE has used
19 old data to provide this information.

12

20 Casks. DOE will change the design of the
21 casks which would be used to transport the high level
22 radioactive waste. The DEIS does not address whether the
23 new design of the casks has been analyzed. Have these
24 casks been built and tested? What is the integrity of the
25 valves and seals? Full scale cask testing is needed
1 rather than computer simulations.

13

2 Weather. Although weather does not seem to
3 be an issue, Mineral County believes it is a big issue.

4 Most of the nuclear waste would be
5 transported through the northern part of Nevada. This
6 part of the state may have bad weather from November to
7 May. As well as many other states from East, Central and
8 Northwest America.

9 Will the radioactive waste be transported
10 during this time frame? The DEIS does not have adequate
11 information in case of road closures due to inclement

12 weather, nor provide complete information about safe
13 havens.

14

14 Mineral County wants to put on record that
15 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate
16 with regard to addressing transportation. The DEIS should
17 provide feasibility studies and impacts and a
18 comprehensive and thorough analysis of modes and specific
19 routes.

15

20 Transporting highly radioactive waste through
21 43 states possibly affecting about 53 million people is
22 not prudent and would endanger the public and environment
23 along these routes. The cost of cleanup at the Nevada
24 Test Site, cost to build the new routes, rail and roads,
25 and cost to clean up a radioactive accident would probably
1 far exceed finding alternative ways to reuse this nuclear
2 waste.

16

3 Mineral County wants it put on record that a
4 health assessment at the cost of DOE should be done now of
5 all the affected counties. This assessment would reflect
6 what is out there now. By showing the present health
7 situations now, a case may be made for not adding to
8 potential number of latent fatalities and for documenting
9 current health conditions prior to a radioactive waste
10 accident.

11 MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

12 MS. SHANKLE: Mineral County will be
13 submitting more detailed and additional comments by the
14 February 9th comment deadline.