

22 DENNIS SPECTEL: My name is Dennis Spectel. I
23 promise my comments will be short. I'm a resident of
24 Henderson, Nevada. I'm retired and I worked for several
25 decades on oversight of Yucca Mountain and various other
1 nuclear programs and spent enough time in the Navy to know
2 a little bit about that part of the nuclear issues.

3 I guess maybe from my Navy experience and
4 other experience in life, it's clear to me that anything
5 humans do is subject to error, subject to problems. So
6 I think we ought not to be too cavalier in assuming that
7 all the experts are putting everything together, whether
8 it's the transport or the repository program and that
9 everything is going to work out because of that. If the
10 nuclear material is safe, as many people believe it is,
11 it's safe in the individual states and it doesn't
12 necessarily have to come to Nevada.

1 1 13 [My -- my comments, though, are more related to
14 the EIS. There's a couple of things. I reviewed -- I
15 retired from oversight about six years ago, and I had
16 the opportunity to go through the Yucca Mountain EIS,
17 the original one, and spent a lot of time reviewing
18 that, providing comments.

19 And I went through -- didn't go through the
20 entire SEIS for the Caliente route this time. I did
21 read the summary document. I was -- frankly, I was
22 disheartened. All the insight provided by folks who
23 live and work in this area to the original document, no
24 doubt to the document -- the Caliente document is

25 definitely not reflected in that document. It's like --
1 which I -- I believe kind of gets in the credibility of
2 this whole process, you know.

3 We can come out here at night, we can spend a
4 lot of time putting together comments. And if they're
5 not reflected in the document, why bother? Why show up?
6 I means, it's just really disheartening that more
7 insight from people who live in the area is not
8 reflected in the document.]

2

9 [I've got a couple of specific concerns.
10 Looking at the fact that they're proposing to build a
11 railroad for billions of dollars in a very geologically
12 complex area leads me to believe that that's not going
13 to happen. I've been around the block enough that I
14 really can't see that happening.

15 If it does happen, it's going to cost a hell
16 of lot more than that they're saying it is. Leads me to
17 believe -- gets back to the No Action Alternative in the
18 SEIS. That's not even looked at at all. I think it
19 behooves the Department of Energy to have that as a
20 fallback. If that's a fallback, you're going to have
21 waste coming from Reno, Sparks, Las Vegas, number of
22 other communities.

23 And if that happens, other pieces of the SEIS
24 are not comprehensive enough to reflect that, and areas
25 like the socioeconomics section.] [Socioeconomics is more
1 than just jobs. Anybody with a 8th grade education
2 knows that. It can be cultural attributes that Calvin
3 and others have talked about, Indian, or it can be

3

4 tourism, which is our bread and butter.

5 In Washington, that may be no big deal, but we
6 get about 70 or 80 percent of our revenues from that.

7 So all you need to do is have one accident or some
8 adverse publicity should the railroad and that be built
9 for waste coming through Las Vegas, and we've got a
10 problem.

11 I mean, you say people are risk takers coming
12 here. What about convention planners? They have a
13 liability for people who come in here. And if
14 convention planners figure this is not the safest place
15 to come to, they're not going to come here. They're
16 going to Orlando instead. Our revenues are going to be
17 down -- down the tubes. And you can debate about
18 whether gaming is a good thing or not, but that's our
19 bread and butter.]... Continued below

4

20 [The other thing - terrorism, another thing
21 that hits the heart of the document. They actually said
22 in the document that a plane hitting a canister will not
23 cause any release of material. That's -- that's on
24 page -- I can't find it. I did it have written down.
25 They need to -- if 9/11 is important and we're spending
1 a lot of money on airport security and on Iraq and a
2 number of other things, it behooves us to consider what
3 the potential impacts from terrorism could be from the
4 transport of this waste. And I think that definitely
5 needs to be more rigorously done.]

6

[I also have a quote on -- in 1986, the ... 3 continued

7 Environmental Assessment of Yucca Mountain did
8 acknowledge on page 5-110 that tourism should be
9 looked at in the original environmental assessment, and
10 that was not -- somewhere along the line that got kind
11 of dropped, because it got too complicated.]

5

12 [The other thing is you're putting together
13 public comments here, and I think -- I would
14 recommend -- I would hope that we understand what the --
15 kind of have a census of what the comments are. I hope
16 the document, the comment document comes out before the
17 Final EIS does.

18 Because the Final EIS of the Yucca Mountain,
19 the 2002 document, they -- I believe came out after the
20 final document came out or -- or at the same time as the
21 final document came out. And it was summarized. It was
22 a little difficult to understand where your comment was
23 responded to. So I would hope there would be a separate
24 document so we know how you're treating our comments.]

25 That's my story and I'm sticking to it.