

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

RECEIVED

I agree with the following statements which I have checked:



MAR 02 2000

- 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- 2 The EIS is inadequate because it uses outdated 1990 census data rather than current population data for Nevada.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 *They plan to let it sit in Beowawe for as long as 4-8 hrs. while switching it around.*

I am not sure it will be gamma rays even when properly packed which will increase the cancer rate here.

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 *I think the nuclear railway is an atrocity*
 9 *I think it should be left on site*
 10 *until it is studied more. There is*
too much room for human error
in transportation and permanent storage
at Yucca Mt. Experts say it will
leak into the water table in time and
poison a huge agricultural area in
N.V.

Lee Louden