

21 NOV 09 1989 MR. LAWSON: Louis Benezet and Victoria

22 Gilpatrick and Robyn White.

23 MR. BENEZET: I'd like to continue rather than

2... 24 repeat the remarks I was making earlier today, but first I'd

25 like to say thank you for providing this opportunity to

1 comment.

1 2 Not everything in your document is -- is totally
3 uninteresting or totally wrong. There's some useful
4 information in there, but there's a lot further that needs to
5 go, and -- and I want to highlight some of those points.

2 cont. 6 But I also want to thank the citizens for being
7 here. I think this has been really -- this has been a very
8 good thing.

9 Whether we're for Yucca Mountain or against it,
10 whether we think that nuclear waste can be transported safely
11 or not, the worst thing we can do is let people think we don't
12 care because we do care. We care very much about this issue.

3... 13 I -- I want to start by getting back to the
14 question of the no action alternative and to try to put my
15 question into a comment.

16 I think it's a major failing of -- of
17 this EIS that there is not a realistic no action alternative.

18 I'm here to say that I feel that the -- the
19 bottom line is that I support and I feel we should support
20 real -- a realistic no action alternative where this nuclear
21 waste issue is concerned.

22 The problem with the no action alternative as
23 it's phrased in this document is that it does not give a valid
24 baseline for comparison. You're not looking at a likely
25 alternative in any sense.

1 If Yucca Mountain were to be deemed unacceptable

3 cont. 2 today, within an hour or two, there would already be a panel
3 formed to try to come up with some alternative. Something else
4 would be done. It would not be simply left where it is for
5 10,000 years with or without institutional controls.

6 If you -- if you use that as the basis for
7 comparison, you're including environmental effects that are so
8 great that it makes Yucca Mountain seem far more of a good
9 choice than it really is.

10 I -- I guess if I were to make a comparison, it
11 would be like saying you're giving us a choice being lunch at
12 McDonald's or starvation. That makes lunch at McDonald's look
13 pretty good, but if there was any other alternative -- and
14 believe it -- I would be eating somewhere else.

4 15 To say -- to say something about the National
16 Environmental Protection Act requirements, the basis on which
17 the Environmental Protection Act is based is taking action
18 which is intended to protect, restore or enhance the
19 environment. We're not looking at a proposal and proposed
20 alternative that does these things.

5 21 The nation and the State of Nevada are threatened
22 by the transportation and storage of nuclear waste,
23 transportation of nuclear waste and storage at Yucca Mountain.

24 The proposed action basically moves
25 radioaction -- radioactive waste from where it is and changes
1 the point at which you put it into the environment and
2 furthermore defers the exposure of radiation in the best
3 possible case to future generations.

6... 4 The -- the document here states that the largest
5 levels of exposure would happen after the 10,000 year time
6 frame that you are considering in this document. Those levels

6 cont. 7 of exposure are clearly higher than acceptable levels of
8 exposure.

9 Where is the justification for passing on
10 pollution, contamination, health hazards to unknown populations
11 in the distant future? There is none. It's at whole -- it's
12 totally against the basic principles of the National
13 Environmental Protection Act to do so.

7 14 To get back to the issue of transportation, which
15 I don't feel is adequately addressed, I would like to state my
16 support for Bob Halstead's notion that the NEPA process should
17 be followed in trying to determine preferred alternative
18 transportation for all the different modes of transportation,
19 especially when it comes to heavy-haul and rail, which
20 evidently has not been adequately done.

8... 21 I would like to state my concern about the number
22 of times that the Chalk Mountain route has been proposed by
23 some of our officials locally.

24 I cannot understand the justification for that,
25 personally. I support the Air Force mission to the extent

1 that -- that they need to do it, and the Chalk Mountain route
2 would interfere, obviously.

3 The whole issue that was raised earlier of
4 possible accidents resulting from low flying aircraft and so
5 forth would certainly be increased if shipments went across the
6 Nellis range, and supporting a Chalk Mountain alternative does
7 nothing for the people of Lincoln County except it enhances the
8 likelihood that we will be exposed to nuclear waste shipment,
9 because if you cut a shortcut across the Nellis range, you give
10 a far greater justification of the possibility of taking it off

8 cont. 11 the train in Caliente.

12 So frankly I do not understand why our officials
13 think that's such a wonderful idea. I don't know who they
14 think they're trying to protect.

15 MR. LAWSON: Thirty seconds.

16 MR. BENEZET: I would follow up -- I would
17 follow up Mr. Kaufman's question about which routes are the
8 cont. 18 most risky by saying [which of the proposals are the most risky
19 for Lincoln County?]

20 That's what we need to determine and that's what
21 we need to give you our answer.

9... 22 [In the interest of doing this, we've asked that
23 our local oversight committee give a special attention to
24 identifying the impacts that would be associated with this
25 intermodal facilities in Caliente.

1 Our -- our officials came out and actually
2 supported -- said that they supported having the facility as
3 early as 1995, but the studies so far have not been done to
4 show what the impacts of this would be.]

10 5 [There's no indication that the heavy haul routes
9 cont. 6 would be feasible.] There's -- there's no way of knowing what
7 the cumulative impacts would be of this proposal with the
8 possibility of low level nuclear waste shipments through
9 Lincoln County which might use the same facility.

10 So -- and -- and it's a major concern of mine
11 that though I understand that finally at the late day, a
12 certain amount of money from the County's funding has been
13 diverted to do a study of the risks of this new mobile
14 facility.

15 The results of the study will -- are not out yet.

9 cont. 16 They will probably barely be out in time to have input to you
17 guys by the end of the comment period, and it's -- it's fairly
18 clear that the citizens will not have an opportunity to review
19 these findings or to say whether or not the results are being
20 used to -- to adequately protect the citizens or simply to
21 support a benefits package, which I certainly do not.
22 I'll -- I'll leave it at that. If I have a
23 chance, I'd like to come back.