

RECEIVED

Amargosa Valley Public Hearing

Frank Perna

OCT 10 2001

552367

0044

MR. PERNA: I'm Frank Perna.

9 MODERATOR BROWN: You're next.

10 MR. PERNA: My name is Frank Perna.

11 I'm a Clark County resident, Las Vegas

12 Valley. I just came back from New Jersey this morning

13 and there are two articles in the paper which I will

14 give to the panel. First one is about, "Nuclear Power

15 Plant Safety Examined."

16 Since September 11th, all of a sudden we're

17 talking about attacked by airplane. I've been talking

18 about this nine months in relationship to the Nellis

19 bombing range, which is only two flying minutes away

20 from Yucca Mountain, and also the red flag exercises

21 where we train pilots from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, United

22 Arab Emirates and in the 1980s, we trained Iraqi pilots

23 there. So you could see there might be a little

24 terrorist risk from accident and from suicide. This is

25 talking about that, nuclear power plant safety.

0045

1 The NRC has asked the DOE to look at safety.

2 We find out that they aren't too safe. They haven't

3 done anything or much about safety. Now, if that

552367

4 nuclear waste was moved from that power plant site,
5 you'd still have one official target. You can't move
6 the plants. So it's very significant that after
7 September 11th, that waste cannot be moved. It's too
8 much of a terrorist risk.

9 Then we have something here about military
10 munitions trucks in back-to-back crashes. Now, this
11 isn't the DOE, but it's the Department of Defense. It
12 just goes to show you, you can't trust your government
13 doing anything. One of the trucks, flatbed tractor
14 trailer carrying eight missiles hid a barrier, slid
15 down an embankment and overturned. The driver was
16 charged with negligent driving. The other truck
17 carrying 42,000 pounds of explosive used to fire 155
18 millimeter artillery shells crashed because the guy was
19 coughing after he drank some coffee.

20 Now, as usual, the government probably took
21 the lowest bid on this and, I'll guarantee you, if they
22 move the nuclear waste by truck, they'll do the same
23 thing again.

24 You can have these, sir. Excuse me. I have
25 notes on there. I'm real prepared.

0046

552367

1 Now, as far as the nuclear plants themselves,
2 \$90 million is available to put repository buildings
3 for security and safety on all 106 sites from the \$11
4 billion waste fund. So if the waste stays there and
5 it's been there for 44 years, weapon waste has been
6 around for 56 years in dry cask storage on site, no
7 problems with it, it's very safe, they can build
8 repository buildings on 106 sites and make it far safer
9 than it's ever been and more secure. That's about
10 that.

11 I wrote a little something here. On May
12 23rd, I went to a Bechtel meeting and it was overview
13 of the DOE waste package investigation. And they had a
14 piece on the bulletin board. It says, in regard to the
15 waste package, that there will be a long isolation
16 period followed by a slow controlled release. What
17 they're telling you is, I don't know how long it's
18 going to be isolated, it might be isolated 300 years,
19 or 50 years. But then they're telling you that the
20 casks are going to rot. Of course, they're going to
21 rot. There is brine, microorganisms, that are going to
22 attack the casks. All you have to do on a good metal

552367

23 is get below the skin, then it's going to start

24 corrode.

25 If it corrodes those casks, what about the

0047

1 ventilation fans with tin on them? What about the

2 rails of that little train? What about all the

3 electrical connections? That stuff with lesser metals,

4 it's going to rot more. This was a whole room full of

5 scientists. Why was Yucca Mountain the only site

6 investigated for suitability as a site? It wasn't

7 because it was made of granite because it isn't. Water

8 passes through the mountain. They were surprised when

9 they found moisture in there. There is 10 percent to

10 20 percent of rocks with moistures.

11 It isn't a low seismic activity zone. There

12 was a 5.6 earthquake on that site created a million

13 dollars worth of damage on the site. What about

14 periodic flooding? The 40-mile wash gets a 100-year

15 flood every six years. I don't know why they call it a

16 100-year flood. What about being in a inland sea? The

17 water was offer all these mountains. What about brine?

18 That's what is deposited in the rocks. What about

19 microorganisms? They rot titanium and stainless steel.

552367

20 Yucca Mountain was selected despite all of
21 the above. Yucca Mountain was selected because -- now,
22 I hope you don't think I'm being politically incorrect
23 -- in 1977, a bunch of bullies picked on the
24 politically weakest state and some of these bullies
25 didn't want a nuke dump in their state. That's where
0048

1 we have the NIMBY bill, the "Nuclear Suppository Bill,"
2 and the "Screw Nevada Bill." Someone else thought of
3 those names. I wish I had. If Congress wanted to
4 convey truth in 1997, they would have named it the
5 "Yucca Mountain Unscientific Tyranny of the Majority
6 Bill."

7 MODERATOR BROWN: You're at five minutes now.

8 MR. PERNA: They're up already?

9 MODERATOR BROWN: Yes.

10 MR. PERNA: You didn't even warn me. Let me
11 read a little bit more. They laughed.

12 I shouldn't be attempting humor about a
13 serious subject like transporting toxic nuclear waste
14 across 41 states whose citizens are not insured in case
15 of catastrophic will protecting terrorist targets up to
16 six times a day for decades. This is ignorant.

552367

17 In Congress, the Nuclear Regulatory
18 Commission and the DOE should recommend that Yucca
19 Mountain be declared scientifically unsuitable to
20 President Bush. What about the nuclear waste on 103
21 plant sites? Leave it there. It has been safely
22 stored there for 44 years. In fact, nuclear weapons
23 waste has a 56-year safety record. By default, this
24 44-year safety record or 56 of dry cask storage on site
25 is a scientific reason for making it safer and more
0049

1 secure using advances gained since 1987. And also the
2 \$90 million per site which is available through the
3 nuclear waste fund.

4 And the last reason for not using Yucca
5 Mountain as a nuclear repository is, it is Western
6 Shoshone territory under the 1863 Ruby Valley Treaty.
7 We should abandon the deceitful policies of the 19th
8 century and honor the 1863 Ruby Valley Treaty after the
9 repository is rejected. I suggest that everybody
10 phone, write, e-mail and fax everybody connected with
11 this thing.

12 Thank you.