

***The Yucca Mountain Dump Plan  
Would Launch Up to 211 Barges of  
Deadly High-Level Radioactive Waste  
onto the Waters Surrounding New York City in NJ, NY, and CT***

As part of its plan to transport high-level radioactive waste to Western Shoshone Indian land at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) proposes up to 211 barges carrying giant high-level radioactive waste containers onto the waters of the Hudson River, the Jersey shore, and Long Island Sound. Whereas there is currently very little if any high-level radioactive waste in such densely populated places as Jersey City, Newark and New Haven, these plans would bring many hundreds of tons of these dangerous poisons through those cities. See the second page of this fact sheet for maps of the proposed routes, as well as a breakdown of how many waste shipments are coming from which reactors.

Accidents happen. But what if high-level radioactive waste is involved? U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) design criteria for atomic waste transport containers are woefully inadequate. Rather than full-scale physical safety testing, scale model tests and computer simulations are all that is required. The underwater immersion design criteria are meant to “test” (on paper, at least) the integrity of a slightly damaged container submerged under 3 feet of water for 8 hours. An undamaged cask is “tested” (on computers, at least) for a 1 hour submersion under 656 feet of water.

But if a cask were accidentally immersed under water, or sunk by terrorists, is it reasonable for NRC to assume that the cask would only be slightly damaged, or not damaged at all? Given that barge casks could weigh well over 100 tons (even up to 140 tons), how can NRC assume that they could be recovered from underwater within 1 hour, or even within 8 hours? Special cranes capable of lifting such heavy loads would have to be located, brought in, and set up.

The dangers of nuclear waste cask submersion underwater are two fold. First, radioactivity could leak from the cask into the water. Each barge sized container could hold 200 times the long-lasting radioactivity given by the Hiroshima atomic bomb. Given high-level atomic waste’s deadliness, leakage of even a fraction of a cask’s contents into such vital bodies of water could spell unprecedented catastrophe and disruption. Second, enough fissile uranium-235 and plutonium is present in high-level atomic waste that water, with its neutron moderating properties, could actually cause a nuclear chain reaction to take place within the cask. Such an inadvertent criticality event in Sept. 1999 at a nuclear fuel factory in Japan led to the deaths of two workers; many hundreds of nearby residents, including children, received radiation doses well above safety standards.

**STOP THE ACCIDENT BEFORE IT HAPPENS!**

***Don’t let D.O.E. and N.R.C. get away with  
shipping high-level radioactive wastes on the waterways of CT, NJ, and NY!***


**Urge Your U.S. Senators and Representative to oppose  
the Yucca Mountain dump plan!**

**Call their offices via the U.S. Capitol Switchboard: 202.224.3121.**

**For more information, contact Nuclear Information & Resource Service, 301.270.6477,  
[nirsnet@nirs.org](mailto:nirsnet@nirs.org), [www.nirs.org](http://www.nirs.org)**

# Barge Shipments of High-Level Radioactive Waste on the Waters of NJ, NY, and CT Surrounding New York City

Proposed by U.S. Dept. of Energy under its Yucca Mountain Plan



Map taken from Figure J-9, Routes analyzed for barge transportation from sites to nearby railheads, page J-78 and J-81.

<u>Nuclear Reactor</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u># of Shipments Proposed</u>	<u>Barges offloaded at:</u>
Oyster Creek	Forked River, NJ	Up to 111, along NJ shore	Port of Newark, NJ
Indian Point	Buchanan, NY	Up to 58, down Hudson River	Port of Jersey City, NJ
CT Yankee	Haddam Neck, CT	Up to 42, on Long Is. Sound	Port of New Haven, CT
<b>Total</b>		<b>Up to 211</b>	

Table taken from Table J-27, Barge shipments and ports, page J-83.

Map and table taken from U.S. Department of Energy, "Final Environmental Impact Statement for Yucca Mountain," Appendix J ("Transportation"), Feb. 2002.