

1946 NW Lovejoy Street, #1
Portland, Oregon 97209

24 November 2006

Dr. Jane Summerson
Department of Energy
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management
1551 Hillshire Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134-6421

RECEIVED BY OCRWM CCU
DATE: 11/29/2006

Dear Dr. Summerson,

As a member of the Interested Public, the first question that I have -- one that has not been answered -- is why should the disposal of high level nuclear waste created by commercial producers be paid for by the citizens of this nation? This amounts to a double taxation. In the same vein, the citizens of Nevada are paying a heavy price for not generating any nuclear power. The decision by the US Congress in 1987 to discontinue research on alternate sites for the disposal of high level nuclear waste appears to have been motivated more by political conspiracy than scientific considerations. Nevada is politically isolated. It has not the legislative muscle to fight the federal decision in spite of overwhelming disapproval by the citizens of Nevada for the pending action by the federal government. This is also inherently unfair.

An eventual "permanent closure" referred to in The Site Characterization Progress Report (issued in January of 2001) implies that only a finite amount of high level waste can be accepted at the Yucca Mountain Site. As that is a logical conclusion, my next question is, will the federal government press to discontinue or restrict the creation of more commercially produced high level nuclear waste? If this is not the plan then it is ultimately ironic to saddle Nevada with the prospect of federal responsibility if other sites will become necessary.

The January 2001 report also makes reference (on page 2-6) to "... the inherent uncertainty in estimating the postclosure performance for thousands of years." The Final Environmental Impact Statement of February 2002 (on pages S-43 to 44) refers to "incomplete information" and the "uncertainty in the analyses and findings" of these studies. The Final EIS considers (on page S-63) the advent of "human-caused events such as aircraft crashes, external fires and explosions, and natural phenomena such as seismic disturbances and extreme weather conditions." There is mention (on page S-67) of sabotage but I did not see contingencies for bombing scenarios or the ramifications of global warming. For all these reasons and unforeseen trouble scenarios are there plans to retrieve the canisters with a view towards repairing them or is there no recourse to contain radionuclide contamination in the advent of a catastrophe?

Please peruse the enclosed Associated Press article regarding fabricated and manipulated records and results by USGS scientists in order to expedite the Yucca Mountain project. Can you assuage reasonable concerns raised by this report? My last question at present is how much money (including transportation and safety concerns) is this expected to cost the federal government?

Your attention to my concerns is greatly appreciated. I look forward to your response at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,



Brian Carter
enclosed: one