

[Handwritten signature and initials]
[Handwritten "DOE" in a circle]

RECEIVED

JUL 11 2000

EIS002307

Date: 2/5/00

To: President Clinton
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington D.C. 20500

From: Mary H. Gleason
1648 Turtle Creek Court
South Bend, IN 46637

RE: US Department of Energy Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) of
the proposed Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Facility

Enclosed are my comments on the US Department of Energy Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) of the proposed Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Facility. I became acquainted with the proposed project at Yucca Mountain through a bio-medical ethics course I am taking with Dr. Shrader-Frechette at the University of Notre Dame. The blatant scientific errors in the DEIS convinced me that the proposed Yucca Mountain facility should not be built.

The Yucca Mountain facility presents a great threat to U.S. citizens throughout the country. The shipments of nuclear waste jeopardizes the safety and health of all the people who happen to live in proximity of the shipping routes. The DEIS fails to give adequate consideration to the health hazards, both on site and throughout the country, that the Yucca Mountain facility would introduce. Moreover, the DEIS justifies the project using faulty scientific methods.

I hope that my enclosed comments will help you to recognize the dangers of the proposed Yucca Mountain project. Please make a sincere effort to protect your country by voting to terminate this threatening project. Good luck.

Comments on the
Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a Geological Repository for the Disposal of
Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain,
Nye County, Nevada

1. Section 5.10 of the DEIS is incorrect about the effect of groundwater contamination on the human population because the DEIS does not address the effects of contamination on more susceptible human populations such as children and the elderly.
2. The DEIS is incorrect in saying that there will be few human health impacts from the repository because the effects on vegetation due to temperature changes (cited in Section 5.10 of the DEIS) are not taken into account.
3. Section 6 of the DEIS is incorrect about the risk assessment of the loading and transfer processes because the DEIS fails to give adequate consideration to human initiated risk factors (sabotage or terrorism).
4. Section 6 of the DEIS is incorrect in the evaluation of transportation risks because the DEIS uses outdated models (RISKIND and RADTRAN4) to compute the risk factors.
5. Section 6 of the DEIS is incorrect in its analysis of transportation safety because the DEIS uses average weather conditions rather than conditions that would produce the greatest effects.
6. Section 6 of the DEIS is incorrect about the transportation risks involved because the DEIS uses highway conditions that do not reflect the actual highway conditions that would be present in transporting the spent nuclear fuel.
7. Section 6 of the DEIS is incorrect in the assessment of train accident risks because the DEIS, assuming that the highway and rail conditions will be similar, relies on data from highway conditions to compute train accident risks.
8. Section 6-36 of the Modal Study used in the DEIS is incorrect in the evaluation of the cask safety because the study uses data based on an outdated cask design. Unlike the old casks, the new casks do not have water jacket shields.
9. Section 6-36 of the Modal Study used in the DEIS is incorrect about the assessment of the case in which a cask is punctured because the study assumes that there will be only one puncture in the cask container. If there were multiple holes, the situation would be much more dangerous due to an increased air flow through the cask and the subsequent oxidative reactions.