

RECEIVED

JAN 11 2000

EIS002122

LOUIS BENEZET

1 MR. BENEZET: I'm Louis Benezet from Pioche in Lincoln County. I think I should mention after we heard from the woman from Mesquite that Pioche is also not shown on maps of the area of socioeconomic influence in the EIS. Pioche is the county seat of Lincoln County. It's a prominent town. I don't know why Pioche was neglected. I think if people if the DOE went there, there may be a reason because as you walk from door to door around Pioche, you begin to see signs that people have stuck up on their doors saying: "Do we want -- do we oppose nuclear waste in Lincoln County? You bet."

Lincoln County in the past in about '95 got a reputation as being a county that might be willing to accept nuclear waste transportation or nuclear waste facilities in exchange for large benefits payments, and the -- there was a certain amount of backlash from sources outside the county, but nothing like the hubbub that occurred within the county itself among its own residents. There have been a couple efforts at recall campaigns. There have been advisory questions, and I'm here to tell you that nuclear waste is not a popular item in Lincoln County.

Going past that, I'd like to just make some further comments on the DEIS after the remarks I made at the meeting in Caliente, which by the way was very well attended. I was very pleased with the turnout from the people from our county. I would say that their comments would have been divided into two out of three possible groups. One possible group might be those who say they wanted nuclear waste NUCS, although there wasn't anybody in that group.

Another possible group was the people who said that they didn't want nuclear waste, but -- in other words, but it's coming here, anyway, or but we need the jobs or but this, that and the other thing, and you might call that the butts. And then there's the third group which they called the nuts of which I belong, and those are the ones who say nuclear waste, no way, and we heard from a lot of those people in Lincoln County.

2 I'd like to say about the EIS that after fifteen years of planning, the Department of Energy seems to be totally unprepared to proceed with the project, much -- much less get an Environmental Impact Statement together that has any meaning. You can -- you don't have to read very far into the document to find that they haven't even begun to answer the questions. In Section 1, for example, page 17, you'll find that it's not even clear how much nuclear waste might eventually come to Nevada. There's a number of different possible scenarios.

3 Years ago, we were told that there would be approximately 70,000 metric tons. Now it may be twice that figure. It may be an indefinite amount. This is the sort of question that has to be answered even before we start figuring out what the environmental impact will be. In the same section on page 13 referring to the environmental protection standards, it's clear that the radiation standards for exposure have not been set yet. This is another question that has to be determined before you can even proceed to say what the impacts are likely to be or whether the Yucca Mountain facility would ever meet those standards.

4 In section 2, page 1, the document admits that the final questions of transportation routes -- and we've heard a lot about that tonight -- have not been determined. It's not known whether the stuff will travel by truck, by rail or a combination of the two, and yet the EIS is supposed to be the decision-making document on which those -- those choices will be made. There -- despite the fact that it's supposed to be that decision-making document, there's not sufficient information in the document to make that kind of a choice.

5 In section 2, page 6, it's admitted that the design of the repository itself is an evolving process. I mean, again, we don't even know what we're building. We don't know how much waste is coming. We don't know how it's going to get there, and yet we're trying to say what the environmental impacts are going to be. I would say it's time to go back to the drawing board.

6 [ A second major issue, which a number of people have raised, is the fact that though they are required to come up with a no action alternative by comparison with the proposed action, there is no such thing as a reasonable no action alternative in this document. In fact, in section 1, page 21, the DOE admits that the no action scenarios that they're discussing are highly unlikely. You've got to have a likely no action alternative if it's going to be, as they say in -- in section 2, page 1 that it's supposed to be a baseline for comparison of the impacts. An unlikely scenario and especially one in which you can so egregiously exaggerate the possible negative impacts is simply a way of cloaking the question of whether or not Yucca Mountain is, in fact, a -- a -- you know, a good solution. ]

MR. LAWSON: Thirty seconds, please.

7 MR. BENEZET: The -- [ in section 1, it lists some of the scoping -- page 23 lists some of the scoping concerns that were raised by people in the scoping hearings. Several areas in there I feel that the document does not properly answer. The security requirements for the repository, especially during the post-closure period, there's no description of what -- what these would be and how feasible they would be to implement signs and various other methods of keeping the public out. ]

8 [ There's no description of the security or adequate description of the security requirements around the possible intermodal transfer sites. For those of us in the county who live near the City of Caliente, would our freedom of -- of motion be limited? Would we be able to climb on the hills overlooking the possible site? How far away is it? How large would the buffer area be, especially considering the fact that a terrorist could from above lob some sort of projectile into the area where these casks would be left over the weekend because of the transportation requirements. ]

9 [ Under cumulative impacts, there is not an adequate discussion of the past radiation exposure that Nevadans have -- have faced, and I guess just since you want me to get out of here, I'll show you this. This is a picture that strikes me rather vividly, because if you look in the EIS, you will see transportation maps showing the possible transportation routes for truck and rail which look rather like this at a place, but this is the footprint of nuclear fallout from the years of above-ground testing at the atomic test site. It is absolutely unacceptable for downwinders to be exposed to any further radiation. ] Thank you.