

FEB 29 2000

EIS001880

What insanity to transport nuclear waste!
Mary Lee Diesel

Webster-Kirkwood Times

February 18 - 24, 2000

Mary Lee Diesel
 1204 Oday Ave
 St Louis MO 63119-1036

MORE LETTERS from page 1

Nuclear Waste Transport Through WG "Unconscionable"

I am writing as the pastor of Bethany Lutheran Church and a citizen of Webster Groves to express my great concern and strong objection to the transport of radioactive nuclear waste through our community. It is reported that the plan for transporting this waste will be by means of our railway lines at a rate of every two days for the next 30 years.

The potential for disaster with regu-

lar shipments of this magnitude is enormous. The rail lines that run past my church and the homes of my neighbors are busy 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The potential of a railway accident or of an individual or group determined to cause harm makes it unconscionable to consider endangering the lives and communities that this lethal radioactive nuclear waste would travel through.

I strongly encourage the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management to reconsider and respond with a disposal plan that would minimize the danger to all of our communities and provide opportunities for direct citizen involvement in its design and implementation.

Rev. Stephen Starr
 Bethany Lutheran Church of
 Webster Groves

Write Today To Oppose Nuclear Waste Transports

The U.S. Department of Energy has extended the time for hearings regarding the shipment of nuclear waste through the heart of our cities — Webster, Glendale, Oakland, Kirkwood, Maplewood, St. Louis and Metropolitan East St. Louis — from Feb. 9 to Feb. 28.

In the Feb. 4 issue, the publisher of this truly outstanding community paper spoke of the hazards to our communities that would be imposed on us by the proposed shipments. Debra Wilson requested letters be sent to the Department of Energy (DOE) giving its address. An open letter to Energy Secretary Bill Richardson from State Webster Groves is organizing the leaders of our communities to submit protests to the DOE.

Hundreds of people have testified against the shipment of wastes through this area — or even at all. At one session of the public hearings only three persons spoke supporting the program — all were big money interests that would benefit by getting the problem off their hands, or by being a shipping contractor.

Six thousand shipments for 30 years to concentrate the waste in a "geological repository for irradiated waste" in an area that has not been found to be unreservedly free of seismic disturbance. The "shelf-life" of this material, the period for which it would remain safe. There are many sociological concerns as well as practical concerns of this hair-raising idea. In the event of an accident, sabo-

tage, terrorism, are local emergency services available? Where do we move? At whose expense?

Please write, even if you say little more than "This person speaks my mind." Every letter counts. Some research shows that each letter represents the voices of at least 10 who did not write.

Write today! Address letters to:

Ms. Wendy R. Dixon
 EIS Program Manager
 U.S. Department of Energy,
 OCRWM

Yucca Mt., Site Characterization
 Office

Box 90007, M/S 010,
 North Las Vegas, Nev. 89036-0307.
 Or fax to 1-800-967-0739.

Tedford P. Lewis
 Webster Groves

Suggests Initiative To Build Rail System For Waste

My wife Lynda McDowell and I are concerned about the funneling of East Coast nuclear reactor waste through our neighborhood. We agree completely with Dwight Bitikof's onsite containment solution which he offered in his Feb. 4 column.

We are both research scientists in the Department of Chemistry at Washington University. She is a physical chemist and I am a biologist. A recent article in AAAS Journal Science shows that our government is ignoring

work performed by its own nuclear chemists: There are no safe storage options for nuclear waste.

The driving force to consolidate this toxic material must be to prevent its use by terrorists. Unfortunately there are fanatics willing to suffer lethal radiation doses for the opportunity to poison millions. One could mount an argument for regional containment ponds (East, Midwest, and West) to address this concern.

I would suggest that if trains are to

be used for transport, we need a national initiative for building a new rail system that avoids major population centers. This system could be designed for eventual use for high-speed trains after the national security issues have been mitigated. This is not, of course, a very original idea, since concerns about effective national defense led President Eisenhower to implement construction of the interstate highway system.

Dan Studelska
 Webster Groves

1