

RECEIVED

EIS001565

JAN 28 2000

1 PHILLIP TAYLOR: My name is Phillip Taylor, I am the Perkins professor of physics at Case Western Reserve University here in Cleveland. I perform research in theoretical physics and I teach courses on energy and it's relation to society. The concern that I want to express is that the alternatives to Yucca Mountain studied for comparison in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement are unreasonable. They appear to be straw men set up in order to be easily demolished. For example, alternative scenario two, assumes that the wastes are managed in place for 100 years and then are simply abandoned. They are left to rot until all the planning radionuclides are released in the environment. This is, obviously, an unacceptable choice but it is one that you present as a valid alternative to the Yucca Mountain proposal.

The problem of nuclear waste disposal is a difficult and complex one and needs careful thought. It is not helpful to say, "well, if you don't like our solution, see how you like it if we just walk away from the problem." It is as if I were to offer you the solution, "well, you never should have produced it in the first place and you should stop producing it now." It needs a less flippant solution that takes into account the changing face of nuclear power in this country. The first fact to face is that nuclear power is dying in the U.S. and in the world. But particularly in the U.S. No commercial plants have been ordered in almost a quarter of a century and plants that were built at a cost of \$5,000 per kilowatt are changing hands at \$180 per kilowatt.

2 With the restructuring of the electric utility industry a nuclear power plant has become an albatross about the neck of it's owner, good only for extracting stranded costs from unwilling consumers. Realization of the dangers of global warming will not alter this. What is needed is a plan that takes into account this rapidly changing scene in which bankruptcies of the owners of plants, who are also owners of their attendant wastes will become increasingly common. What happens when the owners of a heap of nuclear waste become insolvent, they walkway from it. Does that sound familiar?

Just like scenario two. Only it happens in five years from now and not in 100 years. We all know that there will not be time to prepare, transport and sequester all the existing waste within that time. Yucca Mountain won't be ready to begin receiving waste until perhaps 2020. The only feasible solution is a temporary one that requires upgrading the safety of storage at all existing sites. The long term solution will have to be found after the short term crisis has been dealt with.

It will require more careful exploration of alternatives than is present in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

In summary, the proposed plan is not feasible because events will have overtaken before it can be implemented. We are faced with a serious problem that needs more imaginative solutions and immediate action. Thank you.