

January 20, 2000

EIS000982

Statement to the Department of Energy:

RECEIVED

JAN 20 2000

Pat Waterston, President
Missouri Coalition for the Environment
6267 Delmar Blvd., 2E
St. Louis, MO 63130
Tel: 314-727-0600
Fax: 314-727-1665

- 1 [I speak in opposition to this dangerous proposal to transport huge amounts of high-level radioactive waste across America to store at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, much of it through my home town, St. Louis, MO.] It doesn't make sense.
- 2 [The nuclear waste genie has been out of the bottle for a long time, and the American people have subsidized an industry that has been unable to clean up its mess for a long time. This proposal further penalizes the American taxpayers by transferring to them the liability for the waste from the utility companies who made the bad decisions to forge ahead without a waste solution in the first place. The cost will be enormous, and the transportation of waste dangerous to millions of Americans as well as air, water and land.]
- 3 [Our community, and indeed any community, would be totally unprepared for the consequences of an accident.]
- 4 [I urge you to stand firm in your defense of the American people in the face of the obvious pressure you are facing from the nuclear energy industry. Admit there are no good solutions, ^{demand. cessation of waste produced,} and begin using the funds you are now spending and propose to spend to protect Americans who live near the sites where the waste is now stored. Become advocates of safe energy solutions, such as the fuel cell, solar power, wind power, etc., and start demanding the research and development funds they deserve.]
- 5... High level ^{radioactive} nuclear waste sites should become monuments to human hubris and a testament to the importance of the precautionary principle, which is now finally gaining ground in international treaties. This is: When an activity raises threats of harm to the environment or human health, precautionary measures should be taken even if some cause and effect relationships are not fully established scientifically. This places the

5 cont. burden of proof on proponents of an activity to prove there is no safer way of proceeding, rather than on victims or potential victims of the activity to prove it will be harmful. It is cheaper and more effective to prevent environmental damage than to attempt to manage or "cure" it.

We expect the public policy of our government to protect the best interests of the American people. This proposal is highly detrimental to our interests.

Thank you.