



webserver@yucca-web.ymp.gov on 01/10/2008 11:51:06 PM

RRR000994

To: EIS_Comments@ymp.gov
CC:
Subject: EIS Comment

User Filed as: Not Categorized in ERMS

January 10, 2008 23:51:06

IP address: 24.10.252.100

The Commentors Name:

---> Eileen Greene

The Commentors Address:

---> 1375 South 1000 West

---> Salt Lake City, Utah 84104

Email Information:

---> visualizations3@gmail.com

---> Add commentor to the mailing list : yes

Contact Information:

---> fax number :

---> phone number : 801 972 3832

---> organization :

---> position :

Comment Text :

--> Thank you for providing this opportunity for public comment.

1 [I would hope that the DOE can seriously consider Armagosa Valley's current role as a substantial producer of both organic & non-organic milk to much of the West, including large metropolitan areas, such as Los Angeles. Considering the distribution of just this one product, this would mean that any potential groundwater or soil contamination could affect many more people than just those living in the main regions being evaluated.]

2 [Considering the amount of shipments going through my state, Utah, I would hope that the DOE would also agree that all of the communities living along the transportation routes that would be affected by a steady flow of radioactive materials through their neighborhoods for a possible 30-50 year transportation period could be made fully aware of what is going on and how it could affect them, and also made better aware of public comment periods. There are many communities living along the transportation route that should be looked at very closely. The neighborhood that my mother grew up in & which I currently live in is within blocks of a rail track that was being considered for Yucca Mountain waste shipments (I am actually not sure of the status of whether this particular rail track is still being considered). There was one elementary school located within less than a block of this rail line, & I am sure that there are many many other places such as this across our country. In fact, I have heard estimates of around 52 million people across the country living within a 1/2 mile of proposed transportation routes. These are people that

will be dealing (at least in the case of my state) with practically daily exposure to radioactive casks. It is important to examine the potential impacts to various aspects of these communities and make sure that the voices of the people in these communities are taken into consideration. My own neighborhood is very against nuclear waste transportation in general.]

3 [In comparing the option of a centralized storage facility ... vs. the option of strengthening onsite storage to allow for hardened protection, we should look at the increase in the amount of people that will be exposed to nuclear waste throughout the transportation period. The only way that any centralized storage facility could actually provide for a permanent solution to limiting nuclear waste exposure would be if all or almost all nuclear waste facilities were to be shut down... otherwise, after the 30-50 years of transportation period, our country will have generated another huge amount of nuclear waste -- similar to what has been done over the last 30-50 years ... in the meantime, as it is likely that our nation's nuclear waste facilities will continue to operate, people living in nuclear waste site communities will continue to be exposed as they have been before ... whereas at the same time, there will be an increase in the amount of people who would be exposed throughout the transportation decades due to the large amount of people living on or around nuclear waste transportation routes ... even after the transportation period is over, it is likely, unless we can come up with another method of dealing with waste, that we would end up having to deal with yet another cross-country nuclear waste transportation venture lasting most likely another 30-50 years or so.]

4 [Perhaps most importantly, I do not feel that the issue of respect for Native Communities should be taken lightly ... I do appreciate the DOE's awareness of the intrusion on the traditional lands of Southern Paiute, Western Shoshone, and Owens Valley Paiute and Shoshone people, and the high adverse effects to a number of American Indian Interests within and adjacent to the region of influence ... at the same time, I am perplexed, considering the awareness of these very important, internationally recognized human rights issues, that the DOE is not appearing to take these issues into consideration when evaluating the morality of the Yucca Mountain proposal in relationship to the rights of indigenous people. The spiritual views of Native American groups should, at the very, very least, be acknowledged as a valid issue for consideration. Would we build a nuclear waste dump among a land considered as sacred to Christian people? Of course we would not ... and henceforth, we should also respect the values of Native American people -- just because these spiritual perspectives are different does not mean that they do not deserve the same respect as other religious perspectives. I am sure you are aware that there is a great deal of disapproval from the Western Shoshone nation regarding this project ... I would sincerely hope that views of these people and the existence of their history be acknowledged and respected and that we keep our country's moral perspective towards human rights in mind.]

Thank You,

Eileen Greene
1375 South 1000 West
Salt Lake City, UT 84104
801-972-3832
visualizations3@gmail.com
