

RECEIVED

553332

OCT 19 2001

We are opposed to the storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain for many reasons. Please forward our comments to Secretary Abraham as follows:

1. Vulnerability of nuclear waste as it is transported to the site. In light of recent terrorist attacks it has become even more obvious that transporting of this waste poses extremely high risks. It is inconceivable that you can guarantee the safety of numerous shipments daily (by rail and/or truck) for the next 30 years. One lapse in security is one too many and could have disastrous consequences. No one in the DOE, NRC, or nuclear special interest groups could ever sanely make the claim that the waste will be safe during transportation. This is actually when it will be the most vulnerable.
2. Libby was fortunate enough to tour the facility as a guest of the Clark County government offices. After first hand viewing of the site, we understand that the DOE and its contractors are doing their best to make the site as suitable as humanly possible (the key word is humanly). However, there is nothing man can do to prevent "Acts of Nature" from occurring. Yucca Mtn. is situated in an earthquake prone region, even the DOE office was destroyed beyond habitation from an earthquake, and there are numerous earthquake faults running right through the tunneled areas! An earthquake could potentially cause damage to the casks leading to waste seepage and ground water contamination. The region is also susceptible to volcanic activity which is how the terrain was originally formed. We do not believe that the scientists involved can predict the course of nature for the next 10,000 years. Any predictions made in the EIS can only be classified as ASSUMPTIONS not scientific data.
3. In traveling to and from Yucca Mtn. from Las Vegas it became clear how close it is to this highly populated city. Las Vegas is and has been for the past 10 years, the fastest growing city in the U.S. Is it really a good move on the part of the federal government to have such a controversial project in the backyard of the fastest growing city?
4. The original government guidelines stated that the site chosen MUST provide 95% geologic barrier containment and 5% man-made barrier containment. Yucca Mtn. does NOT meet these guidelines. We do not know the percentages so we won't try to quote them, but we do know that man-made containment is relied upon in substantially greater proportions than geologic containment. The original guidelines should be followed in determining if this site is suitable!
5. We are also concerned about the negative economic impact to our city. We are one of the cities hit hardest by job loss and economic downturn from the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks. Approval of Yucca Mtn. could keep tourists away and result in continued layoffs and business closures. Personally, our family is concerned about the reduction of residential property values and the potential of never being able to sell our home (we are within a few blocks of a proposed trucking route.)

Please listen to the pleas and concerns of the residents of our state and let the states benefiting from nuclear energy deal with the problem they have created. It's not Nevada's waste - we didn't create it.

Sincerely,

Libby, Tony, & Clint Cammiso
Summerlin (fastest growing community in the United States)