

RECEIVED

0031

OCT 19 2001

24 MR. FRESHWATER: Stewart Michael Freshwater,
25 S-T-E-W-A-R-T, M-I-C-H-A-E-L, Freshwater, just like you

0032

1 drink.

2 Okay. I'm a resident of Nevada, I have lived
3 here, in the Valley since 1952. 5213 Mountain View
4 Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89146.

5 If approving the Yucca Mountain Site as the
6 nation's high-level nuclear waste storage facility is
7 based on it being proven to safely store this waste for
8 10,000 years, then it must not be approved. The
9 Department of Energy, DOE, to even deduce that Yucca
10 Mountain is safe and adequate based on present
11 scientific study is wrong, because I believe that the
12 study is inadequate and not thorough enough.

13 I am convinced that there's no possible way
14 in which present science can absolutely predict the
15 safety of a storage container buried in this
16 ever-changing planet for over the period of 10,000
17 years. A manmade structure has no strength against
18 even the slightest shifts of our massive and powerful
19 earth.

20 For man to think that he can outwit those
21 powers with his limited knowledge is next to madness.
22 No matter how many models science creates in trying to
23 determine and predict the future, nature continually
24 throws at us surprises and upheavals of change in the
25 form of earthquakes, volcanoes, storms, and even the

0033

1 extremes of continental shifts. There is potentially
2 too many unpredictable variables with Earth's activity
3 over 10,000 years to, for accurate predictions.
4 I believe there is no way science can
5 absolutely predict the path and speed at which
6 radiation travels underground. There was a leak from a
7 containment canister or facility. There has been above
8 and below-ground nuclear bomb testing at the Nevada
9 site, test site, for many, many years. The radiation
10 produced from all this testing is free from any
11 manufacturing containment and is allowed to move and
12 mix with the earth as nature sees fit. This
13 contamination is in our soils right now. Again, it is
14 not contained. It is in the same ground that water
15 penetrates, seeps, settles and flows through.
16 We do not even know the exact location of

17 this contamination, where it is moving, and how fast in
18 relation to our ground waters. There might be some
19 detection devices around, but as far as I can tell,
20 it's very limited and the sites are specifically to be
21 determined, and it's not very thorough.

22 This is a real life model that should be
23 studied to gain more knowledge of the very real hazards
24 mankind could be confronted with. DOE science does not
25 even know the extent of this real threat to mankind,

0034

1 and yet is ready to say that mankind is safe with Yucca
2 Mountain as a dump, given the real possibility of
3 leakage at Yucca Mountain. This, to me, is blatant,
4 horribly-misguided science. This represents a very
5 blind, arrogant position that DOE science takes.

6 DOE science also told us that testing nuclear
7 bombs above ground was safe, even while doing studies
8 showing radiation plumes traveling eastward through
9 Nevada and into Utah. If Yucca Mountain is approved,
10 we are planting the seeds for our future potential harm
11 and death. We are acting as terrorists to our future
12 generations.

13 And what about our present-day terrorists?

14 Are we going to provide them with prime targets on our
15 roads while transporting nuclear waste? Can we believe
16 that the transported waste is safe against all types of
17 accidents and natural catastrophes? I do not believe
18 so. We would be laying ourselves open for disaster.
19 We thought the terrorist attack at the World
20 Trade Center was horrible. Well, that maybe pale in
21 comparison to the disasters we could be setting
22 ourselves up for if Yucca Mountain is approved. The
23 recommendation for Yucca Mountain as a nuclear waste
24 depositor should be based on good science, if that is
25 possible, not biased science, and with the possible

0035

1 understanding that science can know or understand all
2 issues and can't give a definitive decision about Yucca
3 Mountain safety issues. What is the best interests --
4 what is in the best interests of our country is not
5 necessary what benefits business, politics, or a sense
6 of urgency.

7 MS. GIL: Sir, could you stop for just a
8 moment? Could you stop, please?

9 (There was a discussion off the record.)

10 MR. FRESHWATER: Let's not just sweep the

11 nuclear waste problems under the carpet, earth, to
12 momentarily get them out of the way. To make a
13 decision affecting 10,000 years of humanity in just a
14 few years is insufficient, immoral, and selfish. Hold
15 off on a decision until more knowledge and wisdom is
16 gained. This would better suit a lasting legacy, not
17 immediate gratification. I

18 If the NRC and the U.S. is sued by the
19 nuclear industry, so be it. Let us put up a defense
20 for what is right for humanity. It was a big mistake
21 agreeing to the set time limit. It was a big mistake
22 in not better managing nuclear technology. Let's not
23 just keep backsliding. We must stop, learn from our
24 mistakes, and try to make a better, safer world.

25 Given the real threat to mankind's safety

0036

1 that nuclear radiation presents, DOE and the Nuclear
2 Regulatory Commission, NRC, needs to re-evaluate their
3 positions to make sound decisions based on logic and
4 wisdom to ensure the public safety. Let's backtrack,
5 and instead of saying to the nuclear industry and the
6 NRC, we'll license you to make huge profits and then
7 with a certain period of time, we will be obliged to

8 provide a waste facility for your dangerous waste that
9 you produce, NRC should be saying that, if you want to
10 use nuclear energy, you must develop technology in
11 order to not produce dangerous radioactive waste or
12 neutralize it. Put the horse before the cart.

13 If you or your customers will not foot the
14 bill for this development, then your industry is not
15 viable, and you cannot be licensed. The burden should
16 not be put on the American taxpayers who are
17 shouldering the bills and paying the high price for
18 safety, so the nuclear industry can make their huge
19 profits. This is wrong. What exists is the nuclear
20 side of government supporting the private nuclear
21 sector. The bed has been made and the private and
22 public sectors are sleeping together.

23 As a Las Vegas Valley resident since 1952,
24 and in my 19 years of working with the DOE contractor,
25 I have seen private nuclear proponents acquire public

0037

1 positions. The two sides have kept close ties with
2 each other, and worked to support each other at almost
3 all costs. What we are caught up in here is an ugly
4 quagmire of capitalistic greed, self-serving politics,

5 and misguided scientific arrogance.

6 To the public's detriment, this mixture of
7 ingredients has created a soup that is more unpalatable
8 and potentially more deadly than the most naturally
9 stagnant carcass contaminated water hole. In the worst
10 of conditions, these conditions must not be allowed to
11 continue. Do not recommend the construction of a
12 high-level nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain.