

RECEIVED

EIS000651

20 MS. SWARTZ: My name is Ginger Swartz and I  
21 **NOV 09 1999** represent the Office of the Governor, Nevada Agency for Nuclear  
22 Projects and my task today is to present a statement on behalf  
23 of Robert Loux, the Executive Director of that agency.

24 The Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the  
25 proposed Yucca Mountain High-Level Radioactive Waste Repository

ATLAS REPORTING SERVICES  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA  
(888) 4-ATLAS-1

~~17~~

①

1 Program and the public process by which the US Department of  
2 Energy is seeking to obtain public comments on the draft  
3 document are sub -- substantively -- I'm sorry. Substantively  
4 and legally deficient.

1 5 Among other deficiencies, first the Draft EIS  
2 6 does not contain an accurate description of the project. It  
7 postulates a no action alternative that is unrealistic and  
8 unreasonable.

3 9 It fails to adequately evaluate the health,  
10 safety and environmental impacts of a program that will  
11 intentionally, as part of the so-called waste isolation  
12 strategy, contaminate a groundwater source that is currently  
13 and will be in the future used by people for drinking, food  
14 production and other needs.

4 15 It fails to adequately assess cumulative impacts  
16 from past, current and future activities at the Nevada Test  
5 17 Site. It fails to identify spent fuel and high-level waste  
18 shipping modes and routes in a way that permits people in  
19 affected communities to participate in the review and public  
6 20 comment process, and it completely ignores the potential for  
21 major and widespread socioeconomic impacts from the project,  
22 both in Nevada and in cities and communities throughout the  
23 nation.

7 24 With respect to Caliente, Lincoln County and  
25 eastern Nevada, the draft EIS ignores issues and impacts

7  
continued on  
page 3

①  
②

7  
continued

1 associated with potential cumulative effects of radiation  
2 exposures from atmospheric releases associated with the testing  
3 of nuclear weapons.

4 As a downwind county and region, Lincoln County,  
5 the City of Caliente and other parts of eastern Nevada were  
6 regularly exposed to exposures to fallout, first as a result of  
7 above-ground a topic tests, and later as a consequence of  
8 containment failures involving underground tests.

9 The Draft EIS should have comprehensively  
10 evaluated the potential health effects of his past exposures in  
11 light of the cumulative exposures that would occur as a result  
12 of the operations of a repository and the transportation of  
13 spent fuel and high-level radioactive waste through Caliente  
14 and other eastern Nevada communities.

15 Especially significant are potential impacts to  
16 current residents who were either present during radiation  
17 exposures from testing activities or who are in any genetically  
18 related to residents who were exposed.

8

19 Likewise the Draft EIS fails to adequately  
20 evaluate the range of impacts associated with the location and  
21 operations of an intermodal transfer facility in Caliente and  
22 with the transportation of spent fuel and high-level waste from  
23 Caliente to Yucca Mountain.

24 Mr. Robert Halstead, transportation advisor for  
25 the Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects will address this issue

19

23

1 in more detail as he'll be the next speaker.

9

2                   | The Draft EIS ignores a robust and extensive body  
3 of research produced by the State of Nevada, by independent  
4 researchers and even by DOE contractors that clearly  
5 demonstrates the socioeconomic risks and potential impacts  
6 associated with the repository and repository related spent  
7 fuel and high-level waste transportation.

8                   It is well documented that people react strongly  
9 and negatively to nuclear waste facilities and activities. In  
10 fact, nuclear waste is consistently ranked among the highest  
11 risks to be encountered.

12                   In response to such perceptions, people behave in  
13 ways that have direct and measurable economic consequences such  
14 as avoidance of places and products associated with nuclear  
15 imagery or stigma.

16                   The Draft EIS completely ignores this finding and  
17 does not consider the socioeconomic consequences of such stigma  
18 to cities such as Las Vegas and other tourist destinations and  
19 to rural communities like Caliente and Lincoln County. |

20                   The State of Nevada will be submitting extensive  
21 written comments on this Draft Environmental Impact Statement.  
22 It is our hope that these comments and those of all others will  
23 be seriously considered and that a reasonable no action  
24 alternative as opposed to the unreasonable and unrealistic no  
25 action alternatives contained in the draft document will be

1 selected as the preferred action in the Final Environmental  
2 Impact Statement.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

5 MS. SWEENEY: Thank you.

6 MR. LAWSON: The next speaker is Bob Halstead,  
7 to be followed by Fred Dilger or Dilger and then Louis  
8 Benezette. Close?

9 Mr. Halstead, please.

~~A~~  
(S)