

22 MR. PERRY: My name is Dan Perry, P-E-R-R-Y.
23 I'm a Nevada resident living in Las Vegas.
24 I'm an engineer working in non-related fields. I have
25 no affiliation or potential affiliation with any party

SEP 05 2001

550669

0087

1 involved with the project. The existence and continued
2 creation of spent nuclear fuel are a fact of life in
3 the U.S. That spent fuel is now scattered across the
4 nation at who knows what locations.

5 The problem with dealing with this material
6 is a national problem. To my awareness at this time,
7 we have not developed a method to completely detoxify
8 the material. When and if we ever do develop the means
9 to detoxify the material, we can bet it will be very
10 expensive.

11 It seems to me that it is best if we, as a
12 nation, centralize the storage of spent fuel. The
13 material is not something that we can pour down the
14 sink and make it go away. I believe that we should
15 create a single, best practice facility for handling
16 the spent fuel. The location selected for the
17 centralized storage should be in an area where it has
18 minimal impact to both people and the environment.

19 Personally, I think the atomic test site is
20 probably the best selection for such a site in the
21 entire country. Certainly, there are other possible
22 sites and, yes, we can continue to choose to
23 investigate forever. Investigation is always safe.

24 Do we, as Nevada residents, think that it is

25 better to place the site, let's say, in the middle of
0088

1 Texas or Washington? What do you think the citizens of
2 those states would think? Do we think that national
3 decisions like this should be made on a political basis
4 by who is in office at the particular time?

5 Much has been said and will continue to be
6 said of the risks involved in the transportation of the
7 spent fuel. In our homes, we all have somewhat toxic
8 agents that could make our children and our families
9 sick. Some of us have them under our sinks and in or
10 garages and scattered throughout our homes. Do we move
11 them to centralize them to protect our children? Have
12 we ever dropped a bottle of milk? These are the same
13 issues that are involved with the transportation of the
14 material.

15 There are risks with moving things, but there
16 are also risks with leaving it where it is. We have a
17 good example a few years ago in the handling of our
18 lethal nerve gas that we developed over the years. We
19 set up detoxification facilities for that nerve gas and
20 we had to transport that nerve gas from military
21 facilities throughout the nation to those locations for
22 detoxification. At the time the plan was initiated,
23 there was an uproar about the safety of the
24 transportation. However, the plan went forward and now
25 we live in a safer place.

0089

1 I feel that we should move forward with the

550669

2 Yucca Mountain Project and as Southern Nevada citizens,
3 we should work with the DOE to ensure the success of
4 the project, which by definition is the safe success of
5 the project.

6 We are all U.S. citizens and have all reaped
7 the benefits of the creation of this material. It
8 powers our Navy. It reduces our dependence on oil
9 prolonging the availability of diminishing resources.
10 It has reduced our digging up the arctic tundra,
11 drilling off our coasts. We need to directly and
12 positively address the disposal of this waste.

13 Thank you.

14