

RECEIVED

FEB 15 2000

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

I agree with the following statements which I have checked:



- 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- 2  The EIS is inadequate because it uses outdated 1990 census data rather than current population data for Nevada.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 YUCCA MT IN MY ESTIMATION IS NOT A SAFE PLACE TO STORE NUCLEAR WASTE.

### 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 Why is The DOE CONTINUING TO TELL US THAT YUCCA MT IS THE ONLY PLACE TO STORE NUCLEAR WASTE how ABOUT THE WIPP SITE IN NEW MEXICO? did The government WASTE ALL THAT money IN JUST A TEST? The WASTED MONEY ALL READY SPENT AT THE NOT USABLE SITE AT YUCCA MT, IS A SHAME ON USING TAXPAYERS money FOR NOTHING.

Charles R Harper