

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

I agree with the following statements which I have checked:



RECEIVED

JAN 28 2008

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- 1 The EIS is inadequate because it uses outdated 1990 census data rather than current population data for Nevada.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

Comments:

The Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement describes the impacts of constructing and operating a repository, including transporting nuclear waste by legal weight truck, rail, or rail to heavy haul truck. 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:

- 5 *I am concerned about the potential for earthquakes at Yucca Mountain. It is not a safe place to permanently store nuclear ~~waste~~ waste.*
- 6 *I don't think transportation issues have been adequately explored. I don't think transporting waste from the east coast is safe. There are too many potential accidents that can occur.*
- 7 *Instead of treating this as a POLITICAL issue, it should be treated as a SCIENTIFIC issue. Scientifically YUCCA Mountain is unsafe.*