

• • • •

Comment on the Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement

I agree with the following statements which I have checked:



JAN 20 1990

- 1 The No Action Alternatives are not reasonable. The EIS should have a reasonable no action alternative.
- 2 The EIS is inadequate because it uses outdated 1990 census data rather than current population data for Nevada.
- 3 The analysis of transportation impacts in Nevada is insufficient for making modal, corridor and route decisions.
- 4 The floodplain analysis is insufficient for corridor and route selection.
- 5 The impact of stigma on tourism, recreation and agriculture based economies in Nevada should be analyzed.
- 6 The EIS should analyze the impacts of a crash between a military airplane and a nuclear waste rail car.
- 7 Other Study the earthquakes that have happened in the past and are still happening at Yucca Mtn.
- • • •

Comments:

The Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement includes an option to construct a rail line from Beowawe to Yucca Mountain through Crescent Valley to transport nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain. DOE is required to consider all comments submitted regarding the impacts of building and operating a repository including transportation. My comments for the record are:

8 It's been shown that yucca Mtn. is unfit for this use because the ground is unsteady but that does not seem to matter; just change the qualifications a little. The people of Nevada don't want it - but that's alright as nobody else does either we'll get it anyway.

9 Why don't they quit wasting the billions they have wasted on these farces they call tests (that nobody seems to look at anyway) and use the monies to figure how to recycle this stuff. Or just leave it where it is! If that area around a "Nuclear Power Plant" is safe enough for the plant to stand on it surely is safe enough to hold this "Waste".


Fay Ward

• • • •