

Congressman Crescent Hardy:

Yucca Mountain! Congratulations on a PR (and substantive) coup. Nevada deserves a full debate on this important issue. Argument such as “nuclear waste dump” and “deal with the devil” is devoid of logic and evidence. Considerations of safety and economics should be founded upon both.

Safety: paramount. Every construction site, every industrial facility, is a dangerous place. Every manager, every worker thinks and practices safety first and foremost. Therefore, virtually all operate successfully virtually all the time. Safety breaches make news because they are rare. Nuclear plants are no different. No U.S. warship has ever experienced a nuclear incident. Indeed, America’s only nuclear disaster, Three Mile Island, failed safe. As the *Review Journal* notes, \$330 million would be required from Congress for a Department of Energy technical debate. A bargain.

Assuming a positive safety appraisal, economic benefits to Nevada would be substantial. Nevada must not, will not, be forced by any government agency to accept nuclear material; that win/lose proposition is unacceptable. But successful economic bargaining can be win/win. Nevada would have leverage to bargain aggressively. Recall Joe Biden’s favorite 3-letter word: JOBS—construction and maintenance jobs at Yucca and throughout the country. Also, Nevada could negotiate fees paid by other states to haul nuclear “trash”, increased Colorado River water rights, better transportation and infrastructure funding, increased education investment, Interstate 11 funding. I would add increased security, not only for nuclear material shipping, but also for Las Vegas municipal protection; after all, LV is the epitome of evil to Islamic terrorists. And there are more potential benefits.

“One man’s trash is another man’s treasure.” Those spent fuel rods can be reprocessed for more energy, as is done in France and other venues. Nevada could use that fuel in a new, latest generation nuclear plant—located atop Yucca Mountain. Since our agreement to accept other states’ “trash” would stimulate nuclear construction in those states, perhaps a nuclear contractor could be convinced to build ours as a demonstration project. And we should receive a royalty payment from such construction in other states, and fees from those states, in addition to on-going compensation for hauling their “trash”. Think of the jobs such construction and maintenance, and transportation, would create. Could Nevada receive, say 2¢/hr., from each hour of labor created by our stimulation of such jobs?

More possibilities: electricity output of our nuclear plant would have to be transported to electricity demand locations, including Las Vegas and southern California. High voltage lines require unobstructed rights-of-way, through national parks and wilderness areas, and population centers. Transmission as compressed air could be accomplished via pipelines laid

along existing highway rights-of-way (full disclosure: my company can provide such technology). Further, renewable energy generators, e.g., windmills and/or solar, could perhaps be added to the Yucca site, thereby increasing energy output and thus the value of Yucca-area real estate. Perhaps a town, with schools, churches, parks and shopping malls, would become economically viable.

Congressman Hardy, I again salute you for stimulating this debate. I stand able, and would be delighted, to expand and support these brief thoughts; you might care to visit my website. I look forward to hearing from you, and from others.

Ben M. Enis, Ph.D.  
Founder/CEO

**EnisEnerGen**

[www.EnisEnerGen.com](http://www.EnisEnerGen.com)

1231 Panini Drive, Henderson, NV 89052  
702-617-2533 Office 702-617-2766 Fax  
benenis@cox.net