

015078

December 12, 2006

re: Yucca Mountain Project

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The supplemental EIS does not address how the impact on environmental resources will be monitored, and what happens if impacts are higher than anticipated. And, we don't know what we don't know in regards to safety and environmental impacts.

To Lee Bishop:

Dear Mr. Bishop,

These are my comments about the Mina corridor.

1. The site has not received a license to operate. It is premature to propose a transportation plan to the site. The site has not been proven to meet radiation standards.
2. The Mina corridor would affect more municipalities than the Caliente Corridor, and potentially expose more bodies of water. The Mind corridor poses a greater risk to the public and environment.
3. Public comment has not been adequately obtained. The comment period is short. Hearings have not been held in several cities impacted by shipments along the proposed Mina Corridor. Information has been withheld from the public, and eliciting comments on the Mina Corridor AND the project redesign has confused the public.

To Dr. Jane Summerson:

Dear Dr. Summerson,

These are my comments about the Yucca Mountain Project redesign.

1. The site is not licensed, and has not been proven to meet radiation standards for health.
2. The creation of "aging" pads proposes interim storage at Yucca Mountain. Interim storage is illegal under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.
3. The Institute of Energy and Environmental Health has concluded that Yucca Mountain is an unsuitable site to build a geologic repository.
4. There is a viable alternative to storage at Yucca Mountain that entails secure storage of spent radioactive materials onsite at reactor sites.

Robbin Palmer
 4430 Fairview Rd
 Reno NV 89511