

RECEIVED

0156

SEP 05 2001

550702

9 MS. NAVIS: My name is Irene Navis. I am
10 Planning Manager with the Clark County Department of
11 Comprehensive Planning. You've already heard from two
12 of our commissioners that Clark County is opposed to
13 the repository at Yucca Mountain. Since they had
14 limited time to speak, I wanted to address some of the
15 issues they talked about just a little more
16 specifically.

17 Clark County's 15-year oversight of this
18 program reveals that despite all of the studies that
19 have been done at Yucca Mountain, too many unanswered
20 questions remain, even as a site recommendation appears
21 imminent. DOE's work to date reveals the following:
22 Underestimates of the true health and safety risks to
23 people and environment based on inaccurate population
24 figures. Inadequate consideration of the full scope of
25 potential impacts on at least 1.5 million Southern

0157

1 Nevada residents, at least 50 million U.S. residents,
2 and on the 33 million visitors annually to the
3 Las Vegas area.

4 Clark County and the State of Nevada are

550702

5 currently working on an impact assessment to fill in
6 these gaps in information. An inadequate assessment of
7 impacts to minority populations, especially relating to
8 potential property value reductions and emergency
9 preparedness. The lack of a final design for
10 repository.

11 The Department of Energy insists that the
12 flexibility, that they need flexibility to allow the
13 design to evolve as needed. Lack of a comprehensive
14 national study of transportation impacts. The
15 Department of Energy characterizes transportation as a
16 local problem. And insists on addressing this only
17 after the site recommendation.

18 There's no actual fully tested waste package.
19 The proposed casks are merely computer models, yet we
20 are expected to trust that these containers are safe,
21 though they have never been built, let alone physically
22 tested.

23 Ongoing tests at Yucca Mountain. Many of
24 these tests will not be completed and are not even
25 required to be completed prior to site recommendation,

0158

1 or even at the time of license application to the NRC,

2 which could take up to four years to complete.

550702

3 For these reasons, we urge the Secretary of
4 Energy to grant a minimum 60-day extension for the PSSE
5 review. This will provide an opportunity to urge the
6 Department of Energy to not only follow one consistent
7 final set of rules, but to also recognize and address
8 critical unanswered questions to the satisfaction of
9 the scientific community, oversight agencies, and most
10 importantly, the public, prior to site recommendation.
11 Thank you.