

February 7, 2000

Wendy R. Dixon, EIS Project Manager
Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 30307, M/S 010
North Las Vegas, NV 89036-0307

RECEIVED

FEB 14 2000

Dear Ms Dixon:

I understand that there is a decision being made to send nuclear waste across the U.S. by truck and rail transportation to a holding site in New Mexico, and then on to Yucca Mountain. I am writing to let you know that I am opposed to this plan for a number of reasons.

1 First of all, we in Ohio, and Cincinnati and Cleveland, in particular, do not want this harmful material traveling near where we live and work. There are significant health hazards, of which we are all aware, associated with nuclear waste, and even more hazards when it is being moved. The shipping of this hazardous waste is proposed to take 30 years, with 15,000 to 80,000 shipments total. Movement of harmful materials exposes it to the possibility of accidents and there is no safe margin of error with so volatile a cargo. Plus, there is no way that Ohio or any of its cities is equipped to deal with an accident involving the leakage of such waste. The risk to our citizens living along highways and near rail lines is great, to say nothing of the people who work and travel in these areas.

2 Next, this waste has been generated by private industry in contract with the government. Private industry should be responsible for the clean-up of their own waste, not the tax-payers. Setting up government interim and permanent storage sites shifts the cost of clean-up and storage to the public. I understand that there is a fund that industry has been paying into for such purposes, but there will never be enough money in that fund to cover all the costs, let alone for a permanent storage site.

3 Thirdly, the proposed permanent site at Yucca Mountain does not even fit DOE guidelines for a nuclear waste storage site. The mountain sits on a well established fault line that makes the possibility of instability of the site very real. In addition, there is an aquifer beneath the mountain so any waste leakage would leak into underground water supplies.

4 And last, but not least, the land on which Yucca Mountain sits belongs to the Western Shoshone; given to them in a treaty 100+ years ago -- forever. The Shoshone's don't want the storage site on their land and, in fact, the Governor of the state of Nevada has said that they don't want it in Nevada.

5 Why must we go on producing hazardous materials for which we have no safe waste disposal and which is so threatening to our people, animals, land and plant life of our country? We as human beings need to stop going forward with plans which have not been well thought out. It is to the advantage of all of us to stop and think and plan for generations far in the future. Please take time to consider these concerns and discuss them with your colleagues. We all deserve to live in as healthy and safe environment as we can possibly create together.

Sincerely

Diana Hueil 3425 N. Club Crest Av #3 Cinti., OH 45209

