

**WHAT COMES TO MIND WHEN YOU HEAR THE WORDS
"NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORY"?
A STUDY OF 10,000 IMAGES**

Prepared by:

**Paul Slovic, Mark Layman, and James H. Flynn
Decision Research**

November, 1990

Prepared for:

**Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects
Yucca Mountain Socioeconomic Project**

Phase IV-B, Tasks 8.5 and 8.6

Summary

Attempts by the federal government and the nuclear industry to develop sites for disposal of high-level and low-level radioactive wastes have been stymied by public and political opposition. The record of strenuous protest against nuclear waste repositories, as well as the findings of numerous public opinion surveys, make it clear that public opposition is widespread and deeply felt. It is also clear that there is an immense gap between the perceptions of the public and the views of technical experts and nuclear-industry officials.

Given the seriousness of nuclear waste as a public issue, it is surprising that there have been only a few attempts to understand the deeper meaning of nuclear fears and opposition to nuclear waste disposal sites, and to provide some insight into the nature and pervasiveness of people's concerns. One step toward a deeper understanding would be to define the origins of these concerns, the emotions and images that underlie them, and their tractability or stability over time.

We focus, in this study, on the imagery associated with a nuclear waste repository. The idea that images and perceptions influence people's attitudes and behaviors has a long history, going back to the origins of western civilization. More recently, a number of psychologists have held that images are organized and structured in much the same ways as perceptions, beliefs and attitudes. Images are often accompanied by affect and these affect-laden images have been found to have important behavioral consequences.

In earlier research, we used the "method of continued associations" to document the relationship between word-association images and important economic behaviors. The results showed that cities and states had diverse positive and negative images that persisted over time, and that these images were predictive of people's stated preferences for vacation,

retirement and business sites. Image quality was also found to be related to past and future vacation visits. These findings have documented scientifically what manufacturers, entertainers, politicians, advertisers, and public relations specialists have presumed for a long time--images and perceptions exert powerful effects upon human behavior.

In the present study, we recorded 10,000 word-association images from more than 3,300 respondents to four surveys during the period between April, 1988 and January 1, 1990. Following the general method outlined by Szalay and Deese for collecting "continued associations" image data were collected from these respondents based upon the stimulus term "underground nuclear waste repository."¹ Images were collected from a Nevada State sample, including oversamples for Nye, Lincoln and Esmeralda Counties, from the Phoenix metropolitan area, from Southern California and from a national sample. Response rates were high (72 percent to 84 percent) in each survey.

Each of the 10,000 images was assigned to one of thirteen general or superordinate categories, which expressed the dominant theme of the response. All but one superordinate categories contained subordinate categories. All in all there were 92 distinct categories. The two dominant superordinate categories, (1) Negative Consequences and (2) Negative Concepts accounted for more than 56 percent of the total number of images. Many of the smaller categories and subcategories were also quite negative in tone. The five leading subordinate categories, Dangerous/Toxic, Death/Sickness, Environmental Damage, Bad, and Scary, accounted for more than 42% of the total number of images.

¹ The stimulus phrase for one study was, "underground nuclear waste storage facility."

Positive imagery was indeed rare. Category XII, Positive, accounted for only one percent of the images (97 images out of 10,000). Other generally positive categories such as Necessary, Employment, and Money/Income combined for only 2.5 percent of the images.

Jones et al. (1984) have attempted to characterize the key dimensions of stigma, a concept that has been applied to places with adverse environmental characteristics. Two of their major defining characteristics of stigma are peril and negative aesthetic qualities (ugliness, repulsion). These qualities dominate the repository images.

The results are similar for each of the separate survey samples. Close examination of the categories by sample shows that (a) there are differences in some image frequencies from one sample to another, but (b) these differences are quite small and do not change the interpretations in any important way.

The negativity of repository images is remarkably consistent across people of different ages, incomes, education levels, and political persuasions. Women were slightly more likely to rate their images as negative than were men; people aged 65 or older were somewhat more likely to rate their images as positive, as were people who reported their political orientation as very conservative. None of these differences were large.

The information in these image data appears to go well beyond what was obvious or expected on the basis of previous research or the record of public opposition to nuclear waste facilities. These images demonstrate an aversion so remarkably strong that to call it "negative" or a "dislike" hardly does it justice. What these images reveal are pervasive qualities of dread, revulsion, and anger; the raw materials of stigmatization and political opposition. Images pertaining to potential benefits, necessity, and scientific or technical

progress are simply overwhelmed by the negative responses. Concerns by repository proponents that a nuclear waste facility might be adversely perceived if labeled a "dump" clearly misjudge the nature of public images; dumpsite imagery would appear almost positive in comparison to the more prevalent responses.

Nuclear waste exists and must be dealt with. This analysis of 10,000 images shows that a majority of the American public is repulsed by the concept of a nuclear waste repository. The perceptions and emotions associated with a repository are psychologically, politically, socially, and economically important. In particular, the mechanisms of the human mind make it quite possible that places that become repositories for nuclear waste will also become stigmatized through associations with that dread substance. Decisions regarding the siting and management of nuclear waste must be sensitive to these perceptions and emotions and to the lack of trust that underlies them.

**WHAT COMES TO MIND WHEN YOU HEAR THE WORDS
"NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORY"?
A STUDY OF 10,000 IMAGES**

"Words are the images of things."--Simonides, 500 B.C.

1.0 Introduction

This paper is about the images and perceptions associated with a nuclear-waste repository in the minds of the American public. It is no longer news that the public perceives radioactive wastes as exceedingly dangerous. More than a decade of strenuous public opposition to government plans to site disposal facilities for both high-level and low-level wastes make this clear, as do numerous public opinion surveys (Flynn, et al., 1990; Kraft & Dunlap, in press; Kunreuther, Desvousges, & Slovic, 1988; Nealey & Hebert, 1983). It is also clear that there is an immense gap between the perceptions of the public and the views of technical experts and nuclear-industry officials.¹

¹ The following comments, from three prominent nuclear experts, appear typical of the industry and expert viewpoint on nuclear waste disposal.

"Several years ago . . . I talked with Sir John Hill, . . . chairman of the United Kingdom's Atomic Energy Authority. 'I've never come across any industry where the public perception of the problems is so totally different from the problems as seen by those of us in the industry . . .,' Hill told me. In Hill's view, the problem of radioactive waste disposal was, in a technical sense, comparatively easy."

Luther Carter (1987, p. 9)

"Nuclear wastes can be sequestered with essentially no chance of any member of the public receiving a non-stochastic dose of radiation. . . . Why then is the waste problem the Achilles' heel of nuclear energy? . . . Why is the public's perception of the nuclear waste issue at such odds with the experts' perception?"

Alvin Weinberg (1989, pp. 1-2)

"The fourth major reason for public misunderstanding of nuclear power is a grossly unjustified fear of the hazards from radioactive waste.... Often called an 'unsolved problem,' many consider it to be the Achilles' heel of nuclear power. Seven states now have laws prohibiting construction of nuclear power plants until the waste disposal issue is settled. On the other hand there is general agreement among those scientists involved with waste management that radioactive waste disposal is a rather trivial technical problem. Having it as one of my principal research specialties..., I am firmly convinced that

Despite the fact that we already know a great deal about public perceptions in this area, we have two important reasons to learn more, hence this study. First, most of our knowledge comes from rather general questions (e.g., "How great is the risk of a nuclear-waste repository compared with the risks of X, Y, and Z?"). With some notable exceptions (see, e.g., Erikson, 1990; Lifton, 1967; and Weart, 1988), there have been few attempts to penetrate the surface veneer of nuclear fear and provide insight into the nature and pervasiveness of people's concerns, the origins of these concerns, the emotions that underlie them, and their likely stability.

Second, research has documented scientifically what manufacturers, entertainers, politicians, and their advertisers and public-relations specialists have presumed for a long time--images and perceptions exert powerful effects upon human behavior. Recent surveys of residents in one geographic locale, Phoenix, Arizona, have demonstrated remarkably negative imagery associated with the concept of an "underground nuclear waste storage facility" (Mountain West, 1989; Slovic et al., 1989). The nuclear weapons test site located near Yucca Mountain was found to have caused a modest amount of nuclear imagery to be associated with the state of Nevada in the minds of Phoenix residents. People who associated nuclear imagery with Nevada also tended to express much lower preference for Nevada as a place to vacation. These and other findings have led a review panel to conclude:

"The greatest potential socioeconomic difficulty of the proposed repository [at Yucca Mountain] stems from the intense negative imagery associated by the

this radioactive waste from nuclear power operations represents less of a health hazard than the waste from any other large technological industry."

B. L. Cohen (1983, p. 119)

vulnerability of the Nevada economy to changes in its public image. Because of the high profile nature of the whole nuclear waste disposal program, the potential exists for Nevada to become associated with this negative imagery to the detriment of its attempts to attract tourists, conventions, migrants, and new industry to the state."

(Technical Review Committee, 1990, p. 4)

In light of the potential for repository images to infiltrate the images of Las Vegas, other Nevada cities, and the State of Nevada itself, the present study was conducted to determine the precise nature of these images among people throughout the United States, including Nevada.

2.0 Method

2.1 The Method of Continued Associations

Our approach employs word associations to evoke the imagery, knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and affective states associated with the concept of a nuclear-waste repository. The potential for word associations to reveal the mental content of a person's subjective experience was recognized by Plato and has a long history in psychology, going back to Galton (1880), Wundt (1883), and Freud (1924). More recently, Szalay and Deese (1978) have employed the *method of continued associations* to assess people's subjective representative systems for a wide range of concepts. This method requires the subject to make repeated associations to the same stimulus, for example,

war: soldier
war: fight
war: killing
war: fear
war: enemy
war: etc.

Szalay and Deese argue that this association technique is an easy and efficient way to determine the contents and representational systems of human minds without requiring those contents to be expressed in the full discursive structure of language. In fact, we may reveal ourselves through associations in ways we might find difficult to do if we were required to spell out the full propositions behind these associations through answers to questions. Szalay and Deese further contend that responses produced by the method of continued associations are not erratic and whimsical, but are stable and relate clearly and naturally to a person's experiences. They are organized and structured in much the same way as perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes.

A related view is provided by Fiske, Pratto, and Pavelchak (1983), who describe an image as a "cognitive representation, a conception, or an idea, potentially containing both concrete and abstract impressions; ... a mental picture, but not necessarily visual" (p.42). Fiske et al. studied citizens' images of nuclear war, noting that such images could hardly be created except through experiences with the media, books, films, articles, and discussion.

Cognitive images are often accompanied by affect and such affect-laden images have been found to have important behavioral consequences. Prejudicial images give rise to discrimination (Hamilton, 1981). Images of politicians affect voting behavior (Campbell, Converse, Miller, & Stoke, 1960). Images of nuclear war affect an individual's level of antinuclear political activity (Fiske, Pratto, & Pavelchak, 1983).

In a series of recent studies, we have employed the method of continued associations to document the relationship between word-association images, risk, preferences, and

economically important behaviors. Slovic et al. (1989, 1990) demonstrated that cities and states had diverse positive and negative images that were quite stable within an individual over a 16-18 month time period. They showed that the degree of positive and negative affective content across a person's set of images for each stimulus city or stimulus state could accurately predict a person's expressed preferences among these places for future vacation sites, places to retire, or places to locate new businesses. Image quality was also found to be related to past and future vacations in a place. Kunreuther and Easterling (1990) have observed similar relationships between people's images of a city and the likelihood that they would attend a convention in that city.

2.2 Survey Designs and Details

Word associations stimulated by mention of a nuclear-waste repository were elicited from more than 3300 persons in four telephone surveys conducted between April, 1988 and January, 1990. Details of these surveys are provided in Table 1. In addition to a National survey, data were collected from three other populations of special interest: residents of Nevada because of that state's selection as the site of the proposed national repository; Phoenix and Southern California because these are the two major areas from which tourists and economic development in Nevada emanate. The Nevada survey consisted of a sample representative of the entire state and additional samples from Nye County, in which the Nuclear Test Site and the proposed repository site are located, from Lincoln County, which borders Nye County and would contain a major transportation corridor through which the

Table 1
Image Surveys

Survey and Location	Dates	Sample Size	Response Rate (%)
Phoenix	4/13 - 6/8/88	802	72
National	10/21 - 12/7/89	825	77
Southern California	12/6/89 - 1/1/90	801	77
<u>NEVADA</u>			
Statewide	9/25 - 10/15/89	500	74
Nye County	9/25 - 10/15/89	204	74
Lincoln County	9/25 - 10/15/89	101	84
Esmeralda County	9/25 - 10/15/89	101	77
Nevada Total	9/25 - 10/15/89	906	77

Note: The repository stimulus was "underground nuclear waste storage facility" for the Phoenix study and "underground nuclear waste repository" for the National, Southern California, and Nevada surveys.

wastes would travel on its final approach to Yucca Mountain, and from Esmeralda County, another transport corridor a bit farther from the site. Response rates were high (72% - 84%) in all of the surveys.

The images were elicited using a version of the method of continued associations adapted for a telephone interview. The first task in the Phoenix, Southern California, and National surveys was always word association to either a set of four cities or four states. In the Cities survey, the elicitation interview proceeded as follows:

"My first question involves word association. For example, when I mention the word baseball, you might think of the World Series, Reggie Jackson, summertime, or even hot dogs. Today, I am interested in the first SIX thoughts or images that come to mind when you hear the name of a PLACE.

Think about _____ for a minute. When you think about
[CITY]
_____, what is the first thought or image that comes to mind?
[CITY]

What is the next thought or image you have when I say _____?
[CITY]

_____. Your next thought or image?
[CITY]

What is another thought or image you have about _____?"
[CITY]

This continued until six associations were produced or the respondent drew a blank. Then the procedure was repeated for the next city.

Following the elicitation of images, respondents were asked to rate each image they had produced on a scale ranging from very positive (which was later coded by us as +2), somewhat positive (+1), neutral (0), somewhat negative (-1), or very negative (-2).

Respondents were then asked to rank the four cities/states according to their attractiveness as vacation sites. Additional questions assessed the extent of previous visits or living experiences in each of the cities or states. Next, up to six images were elicited to

the stimulus "underground nuclear waste storage facility" (Phoenix survey) and "underground nuclear waste repository" (Southern California and National surveys). Following the elicitation of repository associations, respondents rated each association they gave on the same very positive to very negative scale used with the city or state associations.

Phoenix survey also asked respondents to produce images to the stimulus phrase "nuclear test site." The Southern California and National survey included a variety of other questions comparing perceptions of radioactive waste with other hazards and eliciting judgments about the impacts that a nearby repository might have on local communities. Each of these surveys concluded with a set of questions about the persons's education, income, and other demographic characteristics.

The Nevada surveys were structured slightly differently. The interview opened with a series of general questions about community satisfaction and perceptions of the seriousness of various environmental problems, including radioactive wastes. respondents were introduced to the word-association task and asked to produce associations to the word "Reno." They were then asked to associate to the words "underground nuclear waste repository" and, when they were finished, to rate the affective quality of each association on the positive to negative scale. The remainder of the survey contained specific questions about nuclear-waste repositories and questions to elicit background information about the respondent, much as in the other surveys. The present report describes only the analysis of the repository images. Analyses of the other material in these surveys is presented in Flynn, Slovic, Mertz, & Toma (1990) and in Slovic, Layman, & Flynn (1990).

3.0 Results

3.1 Analysis of the Combined Samples

The 3,334 respondents in the National, Phoenix, California, and Nevada surveys produced a combined total of exactly 10,000 word-association images to the repository stimulus. We examined the content of these associations and developed a classification scheme to assign them to categories. This judgmental analysis resulted in 13 general or superordinate categories, one of which was a miscellaneous category. All but one superordinate category contained subordinate categories--in one case there were 17 subordinate categories that were judged to fit the theme of the major category. All in all, there were 92 distinct categories. Many of these contained multiple associations, judged to have similar meanings. For example, the subcategory labeled Dangerous/Toxic, within the superordinate category labeled Negative Consequences, included the terms danger, dangerous, unsafe, disaster, hazardous, poison, etc.

The 13 superordinate categories and their 92 subcategories contained 9439 word-association images (94.4% of the total). Some 561 associations were left uncategorized (5.6% of the total).

Table 2 presents the 13 superordinate categories in order of their combined frequencies across all four samples. The one exception to this ordering is the relatively large miscellaneous category, which is presented last. The subordinate categories are also shown, ordered by frequency within their superordinate category.

Table 3 presents the same categorization as Table 1 but also includes the totals from the four separate surveys.

Table 2

NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORY IMAGE HIERARCHY ACROSS FOUR SAMPLES

There are 10,000 images across the National, Phoenix, California and Nevada Samples, 9439 of which have been categorized; 561 images have not been categorized.

A superordinate structure has been created. Both the superordinate categories and the subordinate categories within them are arranged according to decreasing number of images.

The hierarchy ends with a miscellaneous set of subordinate categories that do not fit into the superordinate structure.

CAT NO.	FRQ	PER-CENT	SUBORDINATE CATEGORY	SUPERORDINATE CATEGORY
a	1683	16.83	Dangerous / Toxic	I. NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES
b	783	7.83	Death / Sickness	I. NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES
c	692	6.92	Environmental Damage	I. NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES
d	216	2.16	Leakage	I. NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES
e	133	1.33	Destruction	I. NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES
f	18	0.18	Pain and Suffering	I. NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES
g	7	0.07	Uninhabitable	I. NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES
h	6	0.06	Local Repository Area Consequences	I. NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES
i	8	0.08	Negative - Other	I. NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES
TOTAL	3546	35.46		
a	681	6.81	Bad / Negative	II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS
b	401	4.01	Scary	II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS
c	296	2.96	Unnecessary / Opposed	II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS
d	273	2.73	Not Near Me	II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS
e	126	1.26	War / Annihilation	II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS
f	41	0.41	Societally Unpopular	II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS
g	40	0.40	Crime and Corruption	II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS
h	39	0.39	Decay / Slime / Smell	II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS
i	37	0.37	Darkness / Emptiness	II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS
j	32	0.32	Negative Toward Decision Makers and Process	II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS
k	24	0.24	Commands to Not Build or to Eliminate Them	II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS
l	19	0.19	Wrong or Bad Solution	II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS
m	15	0.15	No Nuclear, Stop Producing	II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS
n	14	0.14	Unjust	II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS
o	10	0.10	Violence	II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS
p	5	0.05	Prohibited	II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS
q	15	0.15	Negative - Other	II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS
TOTAL	2068	20.68		
a	245	2.45	Non-Nevada Locations	III. LOCATIONS
b	243	2.43	Storage Location / Containers	III. LOCATIONS
c	237	2.37	Desert / Barren	III. LOCATIONS

(Table continues)

Table 2, continued

CAT NO.	FRQ	PER-CENT	SUBORDINATE CATEGORY	SUPERORDINATE CATEGORY
d	227	2.27	Nevada / Las Vegas	III. LOCATIONS
e	215	2.15	Waste / Garbage / Dumps	III. LOCATIONS
f	107	1.07	Isolated	III. LOCATIONS
g	66	0.66	Facilities and Their Construction	III. LOCATIONS
h	30	0.30	Bury It	III. LOCATIONS
i	20	0.20	Locations - Other	III. LOCATIONS
TOTAL	1390	13.90		
a	336	3.36	Radiation / Nuclear	IV. RADIATION, PHYSICAL STATES
b	55	0.55	Chemicals & Physical States (Liquids, Gases)	IV. RADIATION, PHYSICAL STATES
c	33	0.33	Fire / Hot	IV. RADIATION, PHYSICAL STATES
TOTAL	424	4.24		
a	228	2.28	Safe and Secure	V. SAFETY, SECURITY
b	44	0.44	Facilities Security	V. SAFETY, SECURITY
c	32	0.32	Control, Containment and Cleanup	V. SAFETY, SECURITY
d	27	0.27	Caution	V. SAFETY, SECURITY
TOTAL	331	3.31		
a	119	1.19	Problems	VI. CONCERNS
b	58	0.58	Questions	VI. CONCERNS
	25	0.25	Health	VI. CONCERNS
d	19	0.19	Unsolvable	VI. CONCERNS
e	18	0.18	Family	VI. CONCERNS
f	14	0.14	Uncontrolled	VI. CONCERNS
g	13	0.13	Controversy	VI. CONCERNS
h	11	0.11	Unpredictable	VI. CONCERNS
i	8	0.08	Mistakes	VI. CONCERNS
	7	0.07	Serious	VI. CONCERNS
k	5	0.05	Skeptical	VI. CONCERNS
l	14	0.14	Concerns - Other	VI. CONCERNS
TOTAL	311	3.11		
a	125	1.25	Government / Industry	VII. SOCIETAL INSTITUTIONS
b	106	1.06	Military / Weapons	VII. SOCIETAL INSTITUTIONS
	42	0.42	Science, Technology, Research and Progress	VII. SOCIETAL INSTITUTIONS
d	31	0.31	Political Process	VII. SOCIETAL INSTITUTIONS
TOTAL	304	3.04		
a	124	1.24	Natural Environment	VIII. ECOLOGY
b	25	0.25	Food and Water Supply	VIII. ECOLOGY
c	9	0.09	Climate	VIII. ECOLOGY
TOTAL	158	1.58		
a	156	1.56	Necessary	IX. NECESSARY
TOTAL	156	1.56		

(Table continues)

Table 2, continued

CAT NO.	FRQ	PER-CENT	SUBORDINATE CATEGORY	SUPERORDINATE CATEGORY
a	58	0.58	Cost	X. ECONOMICS
b	57	0.57	Employment	X. ECONOMICS
	29	0.29	Money / Income	X. ECONOMICS
d	5	0.05	Economics - Other	X. ECONOMICS
TOTAL	149	1.49		
a	57	0.57	Uninformed	XI. INFORMATION, KNOWLEDGE
b	39	0.39	Unsure / Unknown	XI. INFORMATION, KNOWLEDGE
	24	0.24	Curiosity, and Knowledge	XI. INFORMATION, KNOWLEDGE
d	9	0.09	Media	XI. INFORMATION, KNOWLEDGE
e	2	0.02	Information, Knowledge - Other	XI. INFORMATION, KNOWLEDGE
TOTAL	131	1.31		
a	59	0.59	Positive, Unconcerned	XII. POSITIVE
b	25	0.25	Effective	XII. POSITIVE
	9	0.09	Improved Environment	XII. POSITIVE
d	3	0.03	Feasible	XII. POSITIVE
e	1	0.01	Positive - Other	XII. POSITIVE
TOTAL	97	0.97		
a	85	0.85	Future / Long Lasting	XIII. MISCELLANEOUS
b	65	0.65	Energy / Power	XIII. MISCELLANEOUS
	38	0.38	Transportation	XIII. MISCELLANEOUS
d	31	0.31	Find Alternatives	XIII. MISCELLANEOUS
e	29	0.29	Natural Disasters (Potential or Actual)	XIII. MISCELLANEOUS
	22	0.22	Population	XIII. MISCELLANEOUS
g	21	0.21	Degree of Distance	XIII. MISCELLANEOUS
h	20	0.20	Neutral / Apathetic / Mixed Feelings	XIII. MISCELLANEOUS
i	14	0.14	Supervision / Responsibility	XIII. MISCELLANEOUS
j	12	0.12	Public Figures	XIII. MISCELLANEOUS
k	11	0.11	Fiction	XIII. MISCELLANEOUS
	9	0.09	Problem Avoidance	XIII. MISCELLANEOUS
m	8	0.08	Inevitability	XIII. MISCELLANEOUS
n	5	0.05	Faith	XIII. MISCELLANEOUS
o	4	0.04	O.K. If...	XIII. MISCELLANEOUS
TOTAL	374	3.74		

Table 3

**NUCLEAR WASTE IMAGE HIERARCHY -- TOTALS
FOR FOUR SURVEYS**

	NUMBER OF IMAGES					PERCENT				
	COMB	NEV	NAT	CAL	PHX	COMB	NEV	NAT	CAL	PHX
I. NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES										
a Dangerous / Toxic	1683	499	393	403	388	16.83	20.38	16.21	16.15	14.74
b Death / Sickness	783	205	183	190	205	7.83	8.37	7.55	7.61	7.79
c Environmental Damage	692	166	199	187	140	6.92	6.78	8.21	7.49	5.32
d Leakage	216	90	44	41	41	2.16	3.68	1.82	1.64	1.56
e Destruction	133	30	46	25	32	1.33	1.23	1.90	1.00	1.22
f Pain and Suffering	18	4	6	4	4	0.18	0.16	0.25	0.16	0.15
g Uninhabitable	7	1	2	3	1	0.07	0.04	0.08	0.12	0.04
h Local Repository Area Consequences	6	0	4	2	0	0.06	0.00	0.17	0.08	0.00
i Negative Consequences - Other	8	0	4	4	0	0.08	0.00	0.17	0.16	0.00
TOTAL	3546	995	881	859	811	35.46	40.65	36.34	34.42	30.81
II. NEGATIVE CONCEPTS										
a Bad / Negative	681	126	159	200	196	6.81	5.15	6.56	8.01	7.45
b Scary	401	93	107	100	102	4.01	3.80	4.41	4.01	3.88
c Unnecessary / Opposed	296	74	66	68	88	2.96	3.02	2.72	2.72	3.34
d Not Near Me	273	33	79	90	71	2.73	1.35	3.26	3.61	2.70
e War / Annihilation	126	11	27	28	59	1.26	0.45	1.11	1.12	2.24
f Societally Unpopular	41	8	17	6	10	0.41	0.33	0.70	0.24	0.38
g Crime and Corruption	40	8	8	14	10	0.40	0.33	0.33	0.56	0.38
h Decay / Slime / Smell	39	13	6	6	14	0.39	0.53	0.25	0.24	0.53
i Darkness / Emptiness	37	4	9	12	12	0.37	0.16	0.37	0.48	0.46
j Negative Toward Decision Makers and Process	32	8	10	10	4	0.32	0.33	0.41	0.40	0.15
k Commands to Not Build or to Eliminate Them	24	5	8	7	4	0.24	0.20	0.33	0.28	0.15
l Wrong or Bad Solution	19	6	5	3	5	0.19	0.25	0.21	0.12	0.19
m No Nuclear, Stop Producing	15	1	6	6	2	0.15	0.04	0.25	0.24	0.08
n Unjust	14	3	5	4	2	0.14	0.12	0.21	0.16	0.08
o Violence	10	5	1	2	2	0.10	0.20	0.04	0.08	0.08
p Prohibited	5	3	0	2	0	0.05	0.12	0.00	0.08	0.00
q Negative - Other	15	1	5	5	4	0.15	0.04	0.21	0.20	0.15
TOTAL	2068	402	518	563	585	20.68	16.42	21.37	22.56	22.23
III. LOCATIONS										
a Non-Nevada Locations	245	6	60	78	100	2.45	0.25	2.48	3.13	3.80
b Storage Location / Containers	243	71	66	57	49	2.43	2.90	2.72	2.28	1.86
c Desert / Barren	237	31	67	64	75	2.37	1.27	2.76	2.56	2.85
d Nevada / Las Vegas	227	44	39	45	99	2.27	1.80	1.61	1.80	3.76
e Waste / Garbage / Dumps	215	50	38	50	77	2.15	2.04	1.57	2.00	2.93
f Isolated	107	13	32	32	30	1.07	0.53	1.32	1.28	1.14
g Facilities and Their Construction	66	24	15	19	8	0.66	0.98	0.62	0.76	0.30
h Bury It	30	13	6	11	0	0.30	0.53	0.25	0.44	0.00
i Locations - Other	20	0	9	7	4	0.20	0.00	0.37	0.28	0.15
TOTAL	1390	252	332	363	442	13.90	10.29	13.70	14.54	16.79

(Table continues)

Table 3, continued

	NUMBER OF IMAGES					PERCENT				
	COMB	NEV	NAT	CAL	PHX	COMB	NEV	NAT	CAL	PHX
IV. RADIATION, PHYSICAL STATES										
a Radiation / Nuclear	336	74	51	63	148	3.36	3.02	2.10	2.52	5.62
b Chemicals & Physical States (Liquids, Gases)	55	18	15	13	9	0.55	0.74	0.62	0.52	0.34
c Fire / Hot	33	3	8	9	13	0.33	0.12	0.33	0.36	0.49
	424	95	74	85	170	4.24	3.88	3.05	3.41	6.46
V. SAFETY, SECURITY										
a Safe and Secure	228	102	48	47	31	2.28	4.17	1.98	1.88	1.18
b Facilities Security	44	2	10	25	7	0.44	0.08	0.41	1.00	0.27
c Control, Containment and Cleanup	32	11	10	8	3	0.32	0.45	0.41	0.32	0.11
d Caution	27	13	7	2	5	0.27	0.53	0.29	0.08	0.19
TOTAL	331	128	75	82	46	3.31	5.23	3.09	3.29	1.75
VI. CONCERNS										
a Problems	119	22	32	26	39	1.19	0.90	1.32	1.04	1.48
b Questions	58	1	23	18	16	0.58	0.04	0.95	0.72	0.61
c Health	25	14	5	4	2	0.25	0.57	0.21	0.16	0.08
d Unsolvable	19	1	5	12	1	0.19	0.04	0.21	0.48	0.04
e Family	18	6	3	5	4	0.18	0.25	0.12	0.20	0.15
f Uncontrolled	14	5	2	3	4	0.14	0.20	0.08	0.12	0.15
g Controversy	13	5	3	4	1	0.13	0.20	0.12	0.16	0.04
h Unpredictable	11	2	3	3	3	0.11	0.08	0.12	0.12	0.11
i Mistakes	8	1	3	3	1	0.08	0.04	0.12	0.12	0.04
j Serious	7	2	0	2	3	0.07	0.08	0.00	0.08	0.11
k Skeptical	5	2	1	2	0	0.05	0.08	0.04	0.08	0.00
l Concerns - Other	14	8	2	3	1	0.14	0.33	0.08	0.12	0.04
TOTAL	311	69	82	85	75	3.11	2.82	3.38	3.41	2.85
VII. SOCIETAL INSTITUTIONS										
a Government / Industry	125	27	25	26	47	1.25	1.10	1.03	1.04	1.79
b Military / Weapons	106	16	23	10	57	1.06	0.65	0.95	0.40	2.17
c Science, Technology, Research and Progress	42	8	8	17	9	0.42	0.33	0.33	0.68	0.34
d Political Process	31	12	8	3	8	0.31	0.49	0.33	0.12	0.30
TOTAL	304	63	64	56	121	3.04	2.57	2.64	2.24	4.60
VIII. ECOLOGY										
a Natural Environment	124	46	28	22	28	1.24	1.88	1.16	0.88	1.06
b Food and Water Supply	25	5	9	7	4	0.25	0.20	0.37	0.28	0.15
c Climate	9	3	2	2	2	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.08	0.08
TOTAL	158	54	39	31	34	1.58	2.21	1.61	1.24	1.29
IX. NECESSARY										
a Necessary	156	40	36	46	34	1.56	1.63	1.49	1.84	1.29
	156	40	36	46	34	1.56	1.63	1.49	1.84	1.29
X. ECONOMICS										
a Cost	58	11	20	8	19	0.58	0.45	0.83	0.32	0.72
b Employment	57	44	4	5	4	0.57	1.80	0.17	0.20	0.15
c Money / Income	29	14	2	6	7	0.29	0.57	0.08	0.24	0.27
d Economics - Other	5	5	0	0	0	0.05	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	149	74	26	19	30	1.49	3.02	1.07	0.76	1.14

(Table continues)

Table 3, continued

	NUMBER OF IMAGES					PERCENT				
	COMB	NEV	NAT	CAL	PHX	COMB	NEV	NAT	CAL	PHX
XI. INFORMATION, KNOWLEDGE										
a Uninformed	57	7	11	15	24	0.57	0.29	0.45	0.60	0.91
b Unsure / Unknown	39	15	5	7	12	0.39	0.61	0.21	0.28	0.46
c Curiosity, Interest and Knowledge	24	8	2	7	7	0.24	0.33	0.08	0.28	0.27
d Media	9	1	1	3	4	0.09	0.04	0.04	0.12	0.15
e Information, Knowledge - Other	2	2	0	0	0	0.02	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	131	33	19	32	47	1.31	1.35	0.78	1.28	1.79
XII. POSITIVE										
a Positive, Unconcerned	59	18	11	15	15	0.59	0.74	0.45	0.60	0.57
b Effective	25	5	9	10	1	0.25	0.20	0.37	0.40	0.04
c Improved Environment	9	4	2	2	1	0.09	0.16	0.08	0.08	0.04
d Feasible	3	1	2	0	0	0.03	0.04	0.08	0.00	0.00
e Positive - Other	1	0	1	0	0	0.01	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	97	28	25	27	17	0.97	1.14	1.03	1.08	0.65
XIII. MISCELLANEOUS										
a Future / Long Lasting	85	17	24	32	11	0.85	0.69	0.99	1.28	0.42
b Energy / Power	65	2	11	16	36	0.65	0.08	0.45	0.64	1.37
c Transportation	38	29	4	2	3	0.38	1.18	0.17	0.08	0.11
d Find Alternatives	31	3	11	11	6	0.31	0.12	0.45	0.44	0.23
e Natural Disasters (Potential or Actual)	29	16	6	6	1	0.29	0.65	0.25	0.24	0.04
f Population	22	6	7	7	2	0.22	0.25	0.29	0.28	0.08
g Degree of Distance	21	17	2	2	1	0.21	0.69	0.08	0.08	0.04
h Neutral / Apathetic / Mixed Feelings	20	1	3	5	11	0.20	0.04	0.12	0.20	0.42
i Supervision / Responsibility	14	5	7	1	1	0.14	0.20	0.29	0.04	0.04
j Public Figures	12	0	3	3	6	0.12	0.00	0.12	0.12	0.23
k Fiction	11	0	2	6	3	0.11	0.00	0.08	0.24	0.11
l Problem Avoidance	9	0	2	3	4	0.09	0.00	0.08	0.12	0.15
m Inevitability	8	3	3	1	1	0.08	0.12	0.12	0.04	0.04
n Faith	5	1	3	0	1	0.05	0.04	0.12	0.00	0.04
o O.K. If...	4	0	1	3	0	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.12	0.00
TOTAL	374	100	89	98	87	3.74	4.08	3.67	3.93	3.31
TOTAL NUMBER OF ITEMS CATEGORIZED	9439	2333	2260	2346	2499					
NUMBER OF UNCATEGORIZED ITEMS	561	115	164	150	133					
TOTAL NUMBER OF ITEMS	10000	2448	2424	2496	2632					
PERCENT OF ITEMS CATEGORIZED						94.39	95.30	93.23	93.99	94.95

Table 4 presents the combined and individual survey results for the 92 subordinate categories, unconstrained by their superordinate categories, ordered by overall frequency in the combined total. A complete listing of all 10,000 images, including those that were not categorized, is presented in the Appendix.

These various tables contain a great amount of information about the nature of people's images of a nuclear-waste repository. The most obvious and most important finding is the extreme negative quality of these images. The three most frequent single associations were dangerous (n = 539), danger (n = 378), and death (n = 306). The dominant subordinate category, Dangerous/Toxic, contained almost 17% of the total number of images. The five leading subordinate categories

Dangerous/Toxic	16.83%
Death/Sickness	
Environmental Damage	
Bad/Negative	
Scary	

were thoroughly negative in affective quality and accounted for more than 42% of the total number of images. The two dominant superordinate categories, Negative Consequences and Negative Concepts accounted for more than 56% of the total number of images. Many of the smaller categories and subcategories were also quite negative in tone.

Positive imagery was indeed rare. Category XII, *Positive*, accounted for only 1% of the images. Other generally positive concepts, *Necessary* (Category IX), employment

Table 4

SUBORDINATE CATEGORIES ORDERED BY DECREASING FREQUENCY

	NUMBER OF IMAGES					PERCENT				
	COMB	NEV	NAT	CAL	PHX	COMB	NEV	NAT	CAL	PHX
I. a Dangerous / Toxic	1683	499	393	403	388	16.83	20.38	16.21	16.15	14.74
I. b Death / Sickness	783	205	183	190	205	7.83	8.37	7.55	7.61	7.79
I. c Environmental Damage	692	166	199	187	140	6.92	6.78	8.21	7.49	5.32
II. a Bad / Negative	681	126	159	200	196	6.81	5.15	6.56	8.01	7.45
II. b Scary	401	93	107	100	102	4.01	3.80	4.41	4.01	3.88
IV. a Radiation / Nuclear	336	74	51	63	148	3.36	3.02	2.10	2.52	5.62
II. c Unnecessary / Opposed	296	74	66	68	88	2.96	3.02	2.72	2.72	3.34
II. d Not Near Me	273	33	79	90	71	2.73	1.35	3.26	3.61	2.70
III. a Non-Nevada Locations	245	6	60	78	100	2.45	0.25	2.48	3.13	3.80
III. b Storage Location / Containers	243	71	66	57	49	2.43	2.90	2.72	2.28	1.86
III. c Desert / Barren	237	31	67	64	75	2.37	1.27	2.76	2.56	2.85
V. a Safe and Secure	228	102	48	47	31	2.28	4.17	1.98	1.88	1.18
III. d Nevada / Las Vegas	227	44	39	45	99	2.27	1.80	1.61	1.80	3.76
I. d Leakage	216	90	44	41	41	2.16	3.68	1.82	1.64	1.56
III. e Waste / Garbage / Dumps	215	50	38	50	77	2.15	2.04	1.57	2.00	2.93
IX. a Necessary	156	40	36	46	34	1.56	1.63	1.49	1.84	1.29
I. e Destruction	133	30	46	25	32	1.33	1.23	1.90	1.00	1.22
II. e War / Annihilation	126	11	27	28	59	1.26	0.45	1.11	1.12	2.24
VII. a Government / Industry	125	27	25	26	47	1.25	1.10	1.03	1.04	1.79
VIII. a Natural Environment	124	46	28	22	28	1.24	1.88	1.16	0.88	1.06
VI. a Problems	119	22	32	26	39	1.19	0.90	1.32	1.04	1.48
III. f Isolated	107	13	32	32	30	1.07	0.53	1.32	1.28	1.14
VII. b Military / Weapons	106	16	23	10	57	1.06	0.65	0.95	0.40	2.17
XIII. a Future / Long Lasting	85	17	24	32	11	0.85	0.69	0.99	1.28	0.42
III. g Facilities and Their Construction	66	24	15	19	8	0.66	0.98	0.62	0.76	0.30
XIII. b Energy / Power	65	2	11	16	36	0.65	0.08	0.45	0.64	1.37
XII. a Positive, Unconcerned	59	18	11	15	15	0.59	0.74	0.45	0.60	0.57
VI. b Questions	58	1	23	18	16	0.58	0.04	0.95	0.72	0.61
X. a Cost	58	11	20	8	19	0.58	0.45	0.83	0.32	0.72
XI. a Uninformed	57	7	11	15	24	0.57	0.29	0.45	0.60	0.91
X. b Employment	57	44	4	5	4	0.57	1.80	0.17	0.20	0.15
IV. b Chemicals & Physical States (Liquids, Gases)	55	18	15	13	9	0.55	0.74	0.62	0.52	0.34
V. b Facilities Security	44	2	10	25	7	0.44	0.08	0.41	1.00	0.27
VII. c Science, Technology, Research and Progress	42	8	8	17	9	0.42	0.33	0.33	0.68	0.34
II. f Societally Unpopular	41	8	17	6	10	0.41	0.33	0.70	0.24	0.38
II. g Crime and Corruption	40	8	8	14	10	0.40	0.33	0.33	0.56	0.38
II. h Decay / Slime / Smell	39	13	6	6	14	0.39	0.53	0.25	0.25	0.53
XI. b Unsure / Unknown	39	15	5	7	12	0.39	0.61	0.21	0.28	0.46
XIII. c Transportation	38	29	4	2	3	0.38	1.18	0.17	0.08	0.11
II. i Darkness / Emptiness	37	4	9	12	12	0.37	0.16	0.37	0.48	0.46
IV. c Fire / Hot	33	3	8	9	13	0.33	0.12	0.33	0.36	0.49
V. c Control, Containment and Cleanup	32	11	10	8	3	0.32	0.45	0.41	0.32	0.11
II. j Negative Toward Decision Makers and Process	32	8	10	10	4	0.32	0.33	0.41	0.40	0.15
VII. d Political Process	31	12	8	3	8	0.31	0.49	0.33	0.12	0.30
XIII. d Find Alternatives	31	3	11	11	6	0.31	0.12	0.45	0.44	0.23
III. h Bury It	30	13	6	11	0	0.30	0.53	0.25	0.44	0.00
XIII. e Natural Disasters (Potential or Actual)	29	16	6	6	1	0.29	0.65	0.25	0.24	0.04

(Table continues)

Table 4, continued

	NUMBER OF IMAGES					PERCENT				
	COMB	NEV	NAT	CAL	PHX	COMB	NEV	NAT	CAL	PHX
X. c Money / Income	29	14	2	6	7	0.29	0.57	0.08	0.24	0.27
V. d Caution	27	13	7	2	5	0.27	0.53	0.29	0.08	0.19
VI. c Health	25	14	5	4	2	0.25	0.57	0.21	0.16	0.08
VIII. b Food and Water Supply	25	5	9	7	4	0.25	0.20	0.37	0.28	0.15
XII. b Effective	25	5	9	10	1	0.25	0.20	0.37	0.40	0.04
II. k Commands to Not Build or to Eliminate Them	24	5	8	7	4	0.24	0.20	0.33	0.28	0.15
XI. c Curiosity, Interest and Knowledge	24	8	2	7	7	0.24	0.33	0.08	0.28	0.27
XIII. f Population	22	6	7	7	2	0.22	0.25	0.29	0.28	0.08
XIII. g Degree of Distance	21	17	2	2	1	0.21	0.69	0.08	0.08	0.04
III. i Locations - Other	20	0	9	7	4	0.20	0.00	0.37	0.28	0.15
XIII. h Neutral / Apathetic / Mixed Feelings	20	1	3	5	11	0.20	0.04	0.12	0.20	0.42
VI. d Unsolvable	19	1	5	12	1	0.19	0.04	0.21	0.48	0.04
II. l Wrong or Bad Solution	19	6	5	3	5	0.19	0.25	0.21	0.12	0.19
VI. e Family	18	6	3	5	4	0.18	0.25	0.12	0.20	0.15
I. f Pain and Suffering	18	4	6	4	4	0.18	0.16	0.25	0.16	0.15
II. q Negative - Other	15	1	5	5	4	0.15	0.04	0.21	0.20	0.15
II. m Nuclear, Stop Producing	15	1	6	6	2	0.15	0.04	0.25	0.24	0.08
VI. f Uncontrolled	14	5	2	3	4	0.14	0.20	0.08	0.12	0.15
II. n Unjust	14	3	5	4	2	0.14	0.12	0.21	0.16	0.08
XIII. i Supervision/ Responsibility	14	5	7	1	1	0.14	0.20	0.29	0.04	0.04
VI. l Concerns - Other	14	8	2	3	1	0.14	0.33	0.08	0.12	0.04
VI. g Controversy	13	5	3	4	1	0.13	0.20	0.12	0.16	0.04
XIII. j Public Figures	12	0	3	3	6	0.12	0.00	0.12	0.12	0.23
XIII. k Fiction	11	0	2	6	3	0.11	0.00	0.08	0.24	0.11
VI. h Unpredictable	11	2	3	3	3	0.11	0.08	0.12	0.12	0.11
II. o Violence	10	5	1	2	2	0.10	0.20	0.04	0.08	0.08
XII. c Improved Environment	9	4	2	2	1	0.09	0.16	0.08	0.08	0.04
XI. d Media	9	1	1	3	4	0.09	0.04	0.04	0.12	0.15
VIII. c Climate	9	3	2	2	2	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.08	0.08
XIII. l Problem Avoidance	9	0	2	3	4	0.09	0.00	0.08	0.12	0.15
I. i Negative Consequences - Other	8	0	4	4	0	0.08	0.00	0.17	0.16	0.00
XIII. m Inevitability	8	3	3	1	1	0.08	0.12	0.12	0.04	0.04
VI. i Mistakes	8	1	3	3	1	0.08	0.04	0.12	0.12	0.04
VI. j Serious	7	2	0	2	3	0.07	0.08	0.00	0.08	0.11
I. g Uninhabitable	7	1	2	3	1	0.07	0.04	0.08	0.12	0.04
I. h Local Repository Area Consequences	6	0	4	2	0	0.06	0.00	0.17	0.08	0.00
X. d Economics - Other	5	5	0	0	0	0.05	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. p Prohibited	5	3	0	2	0	0.05	0.12	0.00	0.08	0.00
XIII. n Faith	5	1	3	0	1	0.05	0.04	0.12	0.00	0.04
VI. k Skeptical	5	2	1	2	0	0.05	0.08	0.04	0.08	0.00
XIII. o O.K. If...	4	0	1	3	0	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.12	0.00
XII. d Feasible	3	1	2	0	0	0.03	0.04	0.08	0.00	0.00
XI. e Information, Knowledge - Other	2	2	0	0	0	0.02	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII. e Positive - Other	1	0	1	0	0	0.01	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00

(Category Xb), and money/income (Category Xc) combined to total only 2.5% of the images.

Other noteworthy features of the combined data are:

- There were 227 associations to Nevada or places in Nevada (Category IIIc). Of these 155 were *Nevada*, 21 were *Las Vegas*, 29 were *Yucca Mountain*, and the rest were other cities or place names. There were also 36 mentions of New Mexico, the state in which the WIPP storage facility is located.
- There were 232 associations pertaining to war, annihilation, weapons, and things military (Categories IIe and VIIb).
- There were surprisingly few (85) associations relating to the long duration of storage necessary for nuclear wastes or the transfer of risk and responsibilities to future generations (XIIIa).
- There were surprisingly few (38) transportation images (XIIIc).
- The famous NIMBY position (not in my backyard) was expressed in 273 images (Category IId).
- Nuclear-waste repositories are sometimes referred to derisively as "dumps." Although dump imagery was definitely present, it was infrequent (40 associations).
- Studies of risk perception have found that people perceive the risks of nuclear reactors and nuclear wastes as highly unknown, uncontrollable, inequitable, and of a dread quality. There were definite signs of these qualities in the images. For example, although the word "dread" was never mentioned specifically, many of the responses categorized as *scary* (IIb) reflect this quality (e.g., fear, horror,

apprehension, terror). There were 39 associations in the category labeled *unsure/unknown*, and only 14 labeled *uncontrolled*. Inequity or unfairness was mentioned only a few times.

- Lack of trust in DOE or other governmental agents is a common finding in studies of public perceptions of nuclear-waste management. Given the obvious importance of distrust, it appears surprisingly infrequently in the image set (mostly in Category IIj, *Negative Toward Decision Makers and Process*, and Categories III and VII, dealing with mistakes). A number of images in the *Bad/Negative* category also seem to reflect lack of trust.
- Jones et al. (1984) have attempted to characterize the key dimensions of stigma. Two of their major defining characteristics of stigma are peril and negative aesthetic qualities (ugliness, repulsion). These qualities dominate the repository images. Peril is pervasive throughout Categories I and II and elsewhere and negative aesthetics form the bulk of the subordinate categories *bad/negative* (IIa) and *Decay, Slime, Smell* (IIh).

3.2 Analyses of Individual Surveys

Is the picture derived from all 10,000 images similar for each of the separate survey samples? Close examination of Tables 2 and 3 shows that a) there are differences in some image frequencies from one sample to another but b) these differences are quite small and do not change the interpretations in any important ways.

The basic similarity across samples is evident from the totals for the two most dominant and most negative categories, I and II. Although the Nevada respondents had the

highest percentage of images in Category I, they were lowest on Category II. Combining totals for the two categories gives a very uniform picture, ranging from a high of 61.9% in the National survey to a low of 55.9% in the Phoenix survey.

To the extent that there were sample differences, Nevada seemed to stand apart from the other three samples. Nevadans expressed relatively more imagery with regard to leakage (Category Id), safety and security (Va), economics (Category X as a whole and employment and money/income images in particular), transportation (XIIIc), and degree of distance (XIIIg). Nevadans had relatively less imagery regarding bad/negative things (IIa), not near me (IId), war and annihilation (IIE), non-Nevada locations (IIIa), desert, and barrenness (IIIc), isolation (IIIf), questions (VIb), and energy and power (XIIIb).

Phoenix residents also had a number of small imagery idiosyncrasies. They had relatively more images about Nevada and Las Vegas (IIIId), waste, garbage, and dumps (IIIe), radiation and nuclear (IVa), Government and industry (VIIa), military and weapons (VIIIb), and energy and power (XIIIg). They were lower with regard to dangerous and toxic (Ia), environmental damage (Ic), and safety and security (Va).

The National sample stood out only with regard to having more imagery about destruction (Ie) and less about waste, garbage, and dumps. The California sample stood out with regard to having more imagery about facilities' security (Vb).

Part of the small deviance exhibited by the Nevada sample may be attributable to the fact that we have included data for the Nye, Lincoln, and Esmeralda County samples in the statewide total. These counties often differed from the statewide sample, hence their inclusion biases the statewide total somewhat. This can be seen from Table 4, which lists

specific images that are disproportionately higher in the state sample (above the line) and disproportionately higher in the counties (below the line). The state sample tends to be higher on the negative images for Categories I and II. The counties have relatively more imagery dealing with transportation, location (i.e., the word "location"), management, ugliness, economy, and necessity.

Note that the counties are not always similar either. Lincoln County residents expressed considerably more imagery related to transportation than did residents of Esmeralda County. Nye County had relatively more imagery regarding management, economy, and necessity and less imagery regarding death.

3.3 Demographic Variables

We have not yet completed a full analysis of the relationship between demographic variables and imagery. However, we have examined the relationships between demographic variables and a person's self-rating of the positive or negative affective value of his or her repository images. Table 6 presents these data for the first image given by the respondent in the California and National surveys.² Examination of these data shows that demographic effects were present but were rarely large. The negativity of repository images is remarkably consistent across people of different ages, incomes, education levels, and political persuasions. There was a slight tendency for more women than men to rate their images as negative and for more men to rate their images as positive. People aged 65 years or

² Each of these surveys had two subsamples depending on whether respondents provided images for cities or states. Each subsample had 400 or more respondents. Data in Table 6 are partitioned by subsamples.

older were a bit more likely to rate their images as positive, as were people who reported their political orientation as very conservative.

4.0 Discussion

4.1 What Have We Learned?

What have we learned by asking more than 3500 people to perform the rather odd task of free-associating to the concept of a nuclear waste repository? Some would answer: the obvious--that people don't like nuclear waste. "What did you expect?"

We believe these images demonstrate an aversion so remarkably strong that to call it "negative" or a "dislike" hardly does it justice. What these images reveal are pervasive qualities of dread, revulsion, and anger; the raw materials of stigmatization and political opposition.

To us, these findings were not so obvious, prior to the studies. Nuclear waste is a by-product of an impressive technology capable of producing massive amounts of energy. Should there not be some representation of energy and its benefits--electricity, light, heat, employment, health, progress, the good life--scattered among the images? We observed almost none.

Second, we did not ask people to reflect on nuclear waste. We asked them about a storage facility (Phoenix survey) and a repository (other surveys). One might expect, following the predominant view of experts in this field, to find a substantial number of repository images reflecting the qualities "necessary" and "safe" (see footnote 1). We observed almost none.

Table 5
Repository Images in Four Nevada Samples

Word/Image	Total Number	Statewide	Nye County	Lincoln County	Esmeralda County	
Base Rate	2476	60.0	19.7	10.	10.2	(100%)
Cancer	34	82.4	11.8	2.9	2.9	
Tragedy	17	82.4	5.9	11.8	0.0	
Future Generations	30	76.7	10.0	3.3	10.0	
Health	64	75.0	10.9	6.3	7.8	
Chemicals	43	74.4	18.6	0.0	7.0	
Death	118	72.9	7.6	6.8	12.7	
Contamination	58	70.7	15.5	3.4	10.3	
Negative	80	70.0	13.8	8.8	7.5	
Water	49	67.3	14.3	10.2	8.2	
Radioactivity	70	65.7	22.9	10.0	1.4	
Danger	321	65.4	15.6	9.7	9.3	
Contaminant	106	65.1	22.6	5.7	6.6	
Pollution	96	64.6	17.7	8.3	9.4	
<hr/>						
Controversial	67	53.7	19.4	16.4	10.4	
Transportation	29	51.7	17.2	24.1	6.9	
Safety	149	49.0	26.8	10.1	14.1	
Location	55	47.3	16.4	18.2	18.2	
Management	32	43.8	37.5	9.4	9.4	
Ugly	54	38.9	25.9	18.5	16.7	
Economy	77	36.4	35.1	11.7	16.9	
Necessary	70	28.6	34.3	18.6	18.6	

Note: Cell entries are percentages, which sum to 100 in each row. Entries above the line reflect specific images for which the state proportion is higher than its overall baseline (60%). Entries below the line reflect images for which the state proportion is lower than its baseline (and the county proportions are generally higher than their overall baseline).

Table 6
Repository Evaluations in Four Surveys: Demographic Effects

California - Cities Survey								California - States Survey							
FEELINGS ABOUT THE FIRST THOUGHT OR IMAGE THAT COMES TO MIND ABOUT AN UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORY								FEELINGS ABOUT THE FIRST THOUGHT OR IMAGE THAT COMES TO MIND ABOUT AN UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORY							
Tabulated(N)	COL = 129 Key Groups	VERY POSTIV	SMWHT POSTIV	NEU-TRAL	SMWHT NEGTV	VERY NEGTV	DONT KNOW	Tabulated(N)	COL = 129 Key Groups	VERY POSTIV	SMWHT POSTIV	NEU-TRAL	SMWHT NEGTV	VERY NEGTV	DONT KNOW
372	ENTIRE SAMPLE	13%	9%	8%	13%	55%	2%	379	ENTIRE SAMPLE	11%	6%	11%	12%	59%	1%
182	Married	12	7	7	13	60	2	185	Married	12	7	11	11	58	1
2	Living as Married	0	50	0	50	0	0	6	Living as Married	17	17	0	33	33	0
106	Never Been Married	13	7	6	14	58	3	112	Never Been Married	8	4	13	13	61	2
43	Divorced	16	19	14	16	33	2	38	Divorced	11	8	13	5	63	0
8	Separated	0	13	13	13	63	0	7	Separated	14	0	0	29	57	0
29	Widowed	14	10	17	10	48	0	23	Widowed	13	4	9	4	61	9
0	Had No Schooling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Had No Schooling	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Compltd Grades 1-8	20	0	40	20	20	0	3	Compltd Grades 1-8	0	0	0	67	33	0
22	Compltd Grades 9-11	14	5	5	14	55	9	25	Compltd Grades 9-11	12	8	12	12	48	8
93	High School Grad	15	13	9	11	52	1	75	High School Grad	16	7	9	9	57	1
131	Some College Educ	11	10	8	15	53	2	145	Some College Educ	10	7	12	12	57	1
86	College Graduate	13	6	6	14	59	2	74	College Graduate	7	7	11	11	65	0
35	Postgraduate Degr	9	3	9	14	63	3	50	Postgraduate Degr	10	0	12	10	68	0
286	White	12	9	9	13	56	2	282	White	11	5	11	10	60	1
21	Black	14	5	5	14	62	0	36	Black	8	11	14	19	47	0
16	Asian	6	6	0	19	69	0	15	Asian	13	7	7	20	53	0
3	American Indian	33	33	33	0	0	0	7	American Indian	29	0	0	0	57	14
40	Hispanic	20	10	5	15	45	5	32	Hispanic	3	6	9	9	72	0
57	18 - 24 Years Old	9	7	2	16	61	5	66	18 - 24 Years Old	11	2	15	14	56	3
97	25 - 34 Years Old	12	7	9	12	58	1	97	25 - 34 Years Old	5	5	6	22	62	0
83	35 - 44 Years Old	11	11	7	14	55	1	94	35 - 44 Years Old	11	7	11	3	68	0
38	45 - 54 Years Old	16	8	8	13	55	0	43	45 - 54 Years Old	14	12	14	2	58	0
38	55 - 64 Years Old	18	3	13	11	53	3	27	55 - 64 Years Old	11	0	19	15	56	0
57	65 Years or Older	14	14	11	12	46	4	45	65 Years or Older	20	9	11	9	44	7
5	Less than \$5,000	0	20	20	0	60	0	8	Less than \$5,000	13	0	0	0	63	25
30	\$ 5,000 - \$14,999	13	17	10	7	50	3	33	\$ 5,000 - \$14,999	6	0	3	19	68	3
60	\$15,000 - \$24,999	17	12	8	13	47	3	33	\$15,000 - \$24,999	17	8	13	6	57	0
67	\$25,000 - \$34,999	16	7	6	15	55	0	67	\$25,000 - \$34,999	9	7	9	16	58	0
69	\$35,000 - \$49,999	13	1	9	10	64	3	74	\$35,000 - \$49,999	14	9	8	9	59	0
39	\$50,000 - \$64,999	15	8	10	15	51	0	51	\$50,000 - \$64,999	10	2	12	18	59	0
26	\$65,000 - \$84,999	4	4	0	27	62	4	29	\$65,000 - \$84,999	14	0	17	7	59	3
34	\$85,000 and Over	6	9	15	15	50	6	38	\$85,000 and Over	5	11	11	8	63	3
171	Male	14	8	11	16	47	4	175	Male	13	9	15	11	50	1
201	Female	11	9	5	11	62	1	204	Female	8	3	7	13	67	1
150	Republican	11	11	13	12	53	0	160	Republican	10	6	9	11	63	1
117	Democrat	11	6	6	16	58	3	131	Democrat	8	5	14	14	59	2
42	Independent	10	12	7	21	48	2	22	Independent	27	5	9	0	59	0
26	Very Liberal	12	0	12	15	54	8	23	Very Liberal	4	4	17	4	65	4
91	Somewhat Liberal	8	2	8	21	59	2	85	Somewhat Liberal	7	4	13	8	67	1
115	Middle of the Road	14	13	8	6	58	1	133	Middle of the Road	11	5	11	12	59	1
100	Swhat Conservative	16	12	9	10	51	2	102	Swhat Conservative	12	10	10	10	58	1
28	Very Conservative	11	4	7	32	43	4	22	Very Conservative	23	5	5	36	27	5

Row percentages sum across to 100%.

Row percentages sum across to 100%.

National - Cities Survey								National - States Survey							
FEELINGS ABOUT THE FIRST THOUGHT OR IMAGE THAT COMES TO MIND ABOUT AN UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORY								FEELINGS ABOUT THE FIRST THOUGHT OR IMAGE THAT COMES TO MIND ABOUT AN UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORY							
Tabulated(N)	COL = 129 Key Groups	VERY POSTIV	SMWHT POSTIV	NEU-TRAL	SMWHT NEGTV	VERY NEGTV	DONT KNOW	Tabulated(N)	COL = 129 Key Groups	VERY POSTIV	SMWHT POSTIV	NEU-TRAL	SMWHT NEGTV	VERY NEGTV	DONT KNOW
395	ENTIRE SAMPLE	20%	9%	9%	8%	50%	4%	370	ENTIRE SAMPLE	14%	6%	10%	9%	59%	2%
229	Married	19	7	10	10	50	4	217	Married	13	8	9	11	56	2
4	Living as Married	50	0	0	0	50	0	3	Living as Married	0	0	0	0	100	0
96	Never Been Married	22	7	5	7	56	2	86	Never Been Married	12	5	12	10	62	0
30	Divorced	13	20	3	10	50	3	35	Divorced	14	0	3	3	77	3
6	Separated	17	33	0	0	50	0	5	Separated	20	0	20	0	60	0
30	Widowed	27	17	17	3	30	7	22	Widowed	23	9	14	5	50	0
1	Had No Schooling	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	Had No Schooling	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	Compltd Grades 1-8	23	15	0	0	46	15	8	Compltd Grades 1-8	25	0	0	0	63	13
38	Compltd Grades 9-11	29	8	11	8	42	3	31	Compltd Grades 9-11	10	3	10	6	71	0
120	High School Grad	21	13	8	5	49	5	99	High School Grad	15	8	8	9	58	2
103	Some College Educ	18	11	10	9	48	5	97	Some College Educ	15	1	5	10	66	2
82	College Graduate	17	2	13	12	55	0	91	College Graduate	11	12	15	9	52	1
38	Postgraduate Degr	18	11	3	13	55	0	42	Postgraduate Degr	12	7	14	14	52	0
347	White	19	10	9	8	50	4	328	White	14	6	10	10	58	1
28	Black	20	7	7	7	50	0	17	Black	0	0	6	0	82	12
8	Asian	25	13	13	13	38	0	4	Asian	25	0	25	0	50	0
4	American Indian	50	0	0	25	25	0	2	American Indian	0	0	0	0	100	0
7	Hispanic	29	0	0	0	57	14	15	Hispanic	7	13	13	13	53	0
48	18 - 24 Years Old	21	2	10	8	54	4	54	18 - 24 Years Old	15	4	7	7	63	4
114	25 - 34 Years Old	13	5	11	9	61	2	93	25 - 34 Years Old	11	6	9	15	58	1
88	35 - 44 Years Old	11	16	7	11	53	1	78	35 - 44 Years Old	15	5	10	9	59	1
55	45 - 54 Years Old	31	5	9	11	36	7	53	45 - 54 Years Old	11	8	6	11	62	2
38	55 - 64 Years Old	24	13	11	3	45	5	38	55 - 64 Years Old	21	8	8	5	55	3
52	65 Years or Older	35	15	6	4	35	6	52	65 Years or Older	12	10	19	4	56	0
17	Less than \$5,000	18	12	6	6	53	6	7	Less than \$5,000	14	14	0	14	57	0
40	\$ 5,000 - \$14,999	28	18	13	5	35	3	40	\$ 5,000 - \$14,999	15	5	8	3	70	0
67	\$15,000 - \$24,999	22	12	3	9	46	7	66	\$15,000 - \$24,999	11	3	11	9	64	3
71	\$25,000 - \$34,999	17	7	4	10	61	1	60	\$25,000 - \$34,999	13	3	13	15	52	3
84	\$35,000 - \$49,999	14	10	11	10	54	2	74	\$35,000 - \$49,999	16	7	5	5	65	1
36	\$50,000 - \$64,999	28	6	14	11	42	0	33	\$50,000 - \$64,999	18	6	12	18	45	0
23	\$65,000 - \$84,999	22	9	17	9	43	0	23	\$65,000 - \$84,999	4	17	9	9	61	0
16	\$85,000 and Over	31	0	13	0	56	0	25	\$85,000 and Over	24	12	12	8	44	0
167	Male	22	7	11	11	46	3	172	Male	13	8	13	12	53	1
228	Female	18	11	7	6	53	4	198	Female	14	5	7	8	65	3
131	Republican	26	14	11	8	40	2	126	Republican	17	4	10	12	57	0
134	Democrat	17	10	8	10	51	4	116	Democrat	11	8	8	10	61	2
49	Independent	14	2	12	8	61	2	55	Independent	11	13	13	7	55	2
27	Very Liberal	11	7	4	11	56	11	20	Very Liberal	25	0	3	5	65	0
74	Somewhat Liberal	15	11	11	5	57	1	72	Somewhat Liberal	10	11	4	18	56	1
130	Middle of the Road	17	11	8	9	52	4	131	Middle of the Road	17	8	9	7	58	2
113	Swhat Conservative	26	6	12	10	44	3	107	Swhat Conservative	10	3				

It appears that the repository has acquired the imagery of nuclear waste, through some process of transference--guilt by association. Will cities and states through which nuclear waste is transported and locations in which it is stored (or nearby) acquire these images as well? The transference is so natural, so powerful, that one state official involved in nuclear safety, upon hearing of our imagery results, indignantly accused us of having biased our respondents by calling the facility a "nuclear-waste repository."

Evidence that the quality of repository imagery has not been heretofore appreciated comes from exhortations by nuclear power proponents to please not use the term "dump" when referring to the repository, because of the obvious connotations or imagery this word conveys (see, e.g., Carter, 1987; p. 416). Not only is dump or garbage imagery relatively infrequent in the observed responses, such images would appear almost positive in comparison to the more prevalent responses.

4.2 How Did It Get This Way?

Imagery so strong and so impervious to influence from technical experts must have very potent origins. Weart's scholarly analysis of images shows that nuclear fears are deeply rooted in our social and cultural consciousness. He argues persuasively that modern thinking about nuclear energy employs beliefs and symbols that have been associated for centuries with the concept of transmutation--the passage through destruction to rebirth. In the early decades of the 20th century, transmutation images became centered on radioactivity, which was associated with

uncanny rays that brought hideous death or miraculous new life; with mad scientists and their ambiguous monsters'; with cosmic secrets of life and death; ... and with weapons great enough to destroy the world ..." [Weart, p.42].

But Weart's concept of transmutation has a duality that is hardly evident in the imagery we observed. Why has the evil overwhelmed the good? The answer undoubtedly involves the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki which linked the dread images to reality. The sprouting of nuclear energy in the aftermath of the atomic bombing has led Smith (1988) to observe:

Nuclear energy was conceived in secrecy, born in war, and first revealed to the world in horror. No matter how much proponents try to separate the peaceful from the weapons atom, the connection is firmly embedded in the minds of the public. [Smith, p.62]

Research on nuclear imagery supports Smith's assertions. A study by Slovic, Lichtenstein, & Fischhoff (1979) found that, even before the accident at Three Mile Island (TMI), people expected nuclear-reactor accidents to lead to disasters of immense proportions. When asked to describe the consequences of a "typical reactor accident," people's scenarios were found to resemble scenarios of the aftermath of nuclear war. Replication of these studies after the TMI event found even more extreme "images of disaster."³

Fiske, Pratto, & Pavelchak (1983) studied public images of nuclear war using a method similar to that employed in the present study. Their results were remarkably similar to our repository images. The dominant themes of nuclear war were physical destruction (long-term, short-term, and immediate), death, injury, weapons, politics, hell, oblivion, nothingness, pain, contamination, radiation, end of civilization, and genetic damage.

³ The fact that the earliest technical risk assessments for nuclear power plants portrayed "worst-case scenarios" of tens of thousands of deaths and devastation over geographic areas the size of Pennsylvania (Ford, 1977) likely contributed to such extreme images. These early projections received enormous publicity, as in the movie *The China Syndrome*.

Dominant emotional images included fear, terror, worry, and sadness, with anger, hate, helplessness, and peace mentioned somewhat less frequently. Much like images of a nuclear-waste repository, images of nuclear war were quite consensual and, for the most part, similar across persons differing in sex, race, political orientation, and education.

Additional evidence of the nuclear war- nuclear weapons-nuclear waste linkage comes from our the data of the present study. Respondents in the original Phoenix survey were asked, near the end of the interview, to free associate to the stimulus "nuclear test site." At the time of this writing we have not yet categorized these images in as precise a manner as we have categorized the repository images. However, it is clear that there is considerable overlap in content across the two image domains. The images "danger" and "dangerous" together occurred in 9.2% of the associations to the repository stimulus, compared to only 6.3% of the associations to the test site stimulus. The word "death" was given in 3.6% of the test site responses compared with 3.1% of the repository responses. Not surprisingly, there was much more imagery concerning bombs, war, and things military in association with the test site, although these were frequent responses to the repository stimulus as well.

The shared imagery of nuclear weapons, nuclear power, and nuclear waste may explain some of the surprising results that have come from surveys that have examined perceived risks for these various forms of nuclear hazards. A nuclear waste repository is judged to pose risks at least as great as a nuclear power plant or a nuclear weapons test site (Kunreuther, Desvousges, & Slovic, 1988). If asked to indicate the closest distance a facility could be built from one's home before one would want to move to another place or actively

protest, people are more averse to being near a nuclear waste repository than any other kind of facility studied, including a nuclear power plant (Flynn et al., 1990).

Further insights into the special quality of nuclear fear are provided by Erikson (1990), who draws attention to the broad, emerging theme of toxicity, both radioactive and chemical, that characterizes a "whole new species of trouble" associated with modern technological disasters. Erikson describes the special dread quality of technological accidents that expose people to radiation and chemicals in ways that "contaminate rather than merely damage; pollute, befoul, and taint rather than just create wreckage; penetrate human tissue indirectly rather than wound the surface by assaults of a more straightforward kind" (Erikson, p. 120). Erikson argues that these disasters have a malevolence that even the authors of Revelations would have found hard to imagine. Unlike natural disasters, they are unbounded. Unlike conventional disaster plots, they have no end. "Invisible contaminants remain a part of the surroundings--absorbed into the grain of the landscape, the tissues of the body and, worst of all, into the genetic material of the survivors. An 'all clear' is never sounded. The book of accounts is never closed" (p. 121).

4.3 Will It Change?

Unlike automobile accidents or natural disasters, to which people become accustomed and blasé, Erikson argues that radioactivity and other toxic substances are naturally loathsome, insidious horrors, which are unique in their capacity to induce a lasting sense of dread. Toxic emergencies, he says, "nourish dread" (p. 121).

There are other reasons to doubt that the images associated with nuclear waste repositories will soon change, even if there are no emergencies to nourish them. For one,

there is an important cultural and educational institution that implants the images of radioactivity, transmutation, and evil into the minds of people at a particularly impressionable time of their lives--the comic book. Hendee (1990) describes an army of supervillians stalking the pages of *Marvel Comics*, all of whom owe their special capacities for evil to exposure to radiation. They include:

- Gargoyle, a Soviet scientific genius disfigured grotesquely in a nuclear weapons accident that also enhanced his intelligence.

Quicksand, a woman whose body has been converted entirely to a sand-like substance which she can shape at will as a result of exposure to a nuclear accident.

- Sunfire, a Japanese mutant with psychokinetic power to ionize matter as a result of being born to an invalid mother exposed years earlier to nuclear radiation in Hiroshima.

If there is a bright side to this phenomenon, it may be that there is a similar array of superheroes as well, who owe their capacities to encounters with radiation (e.g., Spiderman, bitten by a radioactive spider; and Texas Twister, a cowboy with superhuman ability to generate tornadoes as a result of accidental exposure to radioactivity during a tornado that stuck a radioactive waste storage facility in the Panhandle of Texas.) Most recently, a propitious encounter with nuclear waste has created the famous "teenage mutant Ninja turtles."

For those who have outgrown comics, the daily news media provide another form of experience that nourishes fears of nuclear-waste repositories. Most significant is the continuing story of decades of mishandling of wastes at the nation's military reactor sites, which has resulted in widespread leakage and contamination, projected to require more than

\$100 billion for cleanup. In the background are smaller events, such as the recent announcement that the Russian republic has ordered a freeze on new atomic energy projects because the government cannot process and store radioactive wastes properly (*Register-Guard*, 1990).

4.4 Conclusion

Nuclear waste exists and must be dealt with. Our analysis of 10,000 images shows that the great majority of the American public fears and loathes the concept of a nuclear-waste repository. The perceptions and emotions associated with a repository are psychologically, politically, socially, and economically important. In particular, the mechanisms of the human mind make it quite possible that places that become repositories for nuclear waste will also become stigmatized through associations with that dread substance. Decisions regarding the siting and management of nuclear waste storage facilities must be sensitive to these perceptions and emotions.

Erikson (1990) puts it well:

The one thing we cannot afford to assume as we consider how to deal with this new species of trouble is that the fear it evokes is either a passing whim or a fear that can be cooled by the calculations of experts. This dread has its own reasons; it must be respected" (p. 126).

5.0 References

- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., Miller, W. E., & Stokes, D. E. (1960). *The American voter*. NY: Wiley.
- Carter, L. J. (1987). *Nuclear imperatives and public trust*. Washington, D.C.: Resources for the Future, Inc.
- Cohen, B. L. (1983). *Before it's too late: A scientist's case for nuclear energy*. New York: Plenum.
- Erikson, K. (1990). Toxic reckoning: Business faces a new kind of fear. *Harvard Business Review*, (Jan. - Feb.), 118-126.
- Fiske, S. T., Pratto, F., & Pavelchak, M. A. (1983). Citizens' images of nuclear war: Contents and consequences. *Journal of Social Issues*, 39, 41-65.
- Ford, D. F. (1977). *The history of federal nuclear safety assessment: From WASH 740 through the Reactor Safety Study*. Cambridge, MA: Union of Concerned Scientists.
- Flynn, J. H., Slovic, P., Mertz, C. K., & Toma, J. (1990). *Evaluations of Yucca Mountain*. Technical Report: Carson City, Nevada. Nuclear Waste Project Office.
- Freud, S. (1924). *Collected papers*. London: Hogarth.
- Freeze of N-projects ordered. (1990, June 28). *Register-Guard*; Eugene, Oregon; p. 2.
- Galton, F. (1880). Psychometric experiments. *Brain*, 2, 149-162.
- Hamilton, D. L. (1981). *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Hendee, W. R. (1990, February). *Terror and dread in the perception of radiation*. Paper presented at the 23rd mid-year meeting of the Health Physics Society, Atlantic City, NJ.
- Kraft, M., & Dunlap, R. (In press). *The public and nuclear waste: Socio-political dimensions of repository siting*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Kunreuther, H., & Easterling, D. (1990). *Imagery and convention decision making*. Paper in preparation.
- Kunreuther, H., Desvousges, W. H., & Slovic, P. (1988). Nevada's predicament: Public perceptions of risk from the proposed nuclear waste repository. *Environment*, 30(8), 16-20, 30-33.
- Lifton, R. J. (1967). *Death in life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mountain West Study Team. (1989). *An interim report on the state of Nevada socioeconomic studies*. Carson City, Nevada: Nevada Nuclear Waste Project Office. Report NWPO-SE-024-89, June.
- Nealey, S. M., & Herbert, J. A. (1983). Public attitudes toward radioactive wastes. In C. A. Walker, L. C. Gould, & E. J. Woodhouse (Eds.), *Too hot to handle: Social and policy issues in the management of radioactive wastes* (pp. 94-111). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Slovic, P., Layman, M., & Flynn, J. H. (1990). *Images of a place and vacation preferences: Report of the 1989 surveys*. Technical Report: Carson City, Nevada. Nuclear Waste Project Office.

- Slovic, P., Layman, M., Kraus, N., Chalmers, J., Gesell, G., & Flynn, J. (1989). Perceived risk, stigma, and potential economic impacts of a high-level nuclear waste repository in Nevada. Eugene, Oregon: Decision Research Report 89-3.
- Slovic, P., Lichtenstein, S., & Fischhoff, B. (1979). Images of disaster: Perception and acceptance of risks from nuclear power. In G. Goodman & W. Rowe (Eds.), *Energy risk management* (pp. 223-245). London: Academic Press.
- Smith, K. R. (1988). Perception of risks associated with nuclear power. *Energy Environment Monitor*, 4(1), 61-70.
- Szalay, L. B., & Deese, J. (1978). *Subjective meaning and culture: An assessment through word associations*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Technical Review Committee. (1990). Interim statement on the Yucca Mountain socioeconomic project. Carson City, Nevada: Nevada Nuclear Waste Project Office.
- Weart, S. R. (1988). *Nuclear fear: A history of images*. Cambridge: Howard University Press.
- Weinberg, A. M. (1989). Public perceptions of hazardous technologies and democratic political institutions. Paper presented at Waste Management '89, Tucson, Arizona.
- Wundt, W. (1883). Uber psychologische methoden. *Philosophische Studien*, 1, 1-38.

APPENDIX: Complete Listing of Repository Images

I. NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES

a. Dangerous / Toxic

539 DANGEROUS	2 POTENTIALLY DANGEROUS	1 HARMFUL FOR HUMAN AND PLANT LIFE
378 DANGER	2 RUIN	1 HARMING THE EARTH
86 UNSAFE	2 SKULL AND CROSSBONES	1 HARMS PEOPLE
84 DISASTER	2 THREATENED	1 HAZARD TO PEOPLE
67 HAZARDOUS	2 TICKING TIME BOMB	1 HAZARD TO THE PEOPLE
45 POISON	2 TIME BOMB	1 HAZARDOUS MATERIAL
42 TOXIC	2 TRAGEDY	1 HOW DANGEROUS IT IS
39 DEADLY	1 A VERY BAD EXPLOSION	1 INJURIES
38 HARMFUL	1 ALWAYS A DANGER	1 ITS DANGEROUS
31 EXPLOSION	1 BIG ACCIDENT TODAY	1 LIFE STOPPING
27 ACCIDENT	1 BIG BANG	1 MAJOR CATASTROPHE
23 HAZARD	1 BLOW UP	1 MASSIVE TOXIC POISONING
18 THREE MILE ISLAND	1 BLOW-UP	1 MELT DOWN
14 TOXIC WASTE	1 BLOW-UPS	1 MENACE
12 VERY DANGEROUS	1 BOMB GOING OFF UNDERGROUND	1 NO GOOD FOR PEOPLE
11 ACCIDENTS	1 BOOMS	1 NOT VERY SAFE
11 EXPLOSIONS	1 CAN BE UNSAFE	1 NUCLEAR ACCIDENTS
10 POISONOUS	1 CATASTROPHE	1 PERMANENT POISON
8 EXPLOSIVE	1 CATASTROPHIC	1 POISONING
7 CHERNOBYL		
7 LIFE THREATENING		
6 DAMAGE		
6 THREATENING		
5 CORROSION		
5 LETHAL		
5 MELTDOWN		
5 NOT SAFE		
4 DAMAGING		
4 DISASTROUS		
4 RISK	1 DANGEROUS EXPERIMENT	1 SAFETY HAZARD
3 BOOM	1 DANGEROUS FOR CHILDREN	1 SIGNS SAYING HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
3 DANGERS	1 DANGEROUS GROUND WATER	1 SLUDGE, TOXINS
3 EXPLOSIVES	1 DANGEROUS PROPOSITION	1 SOMETHING GOING BOOM
3 HARM	1 DANGEROUS TO HAVE IT NEAR US	1 THREAT OF BEING POISONED
3 KABOOM	1 DANGEROUS TO KIDS	1 TIME BOMB SITUATION
3 NUCLEAR EXPLOSION	1 DANGEROUS, EXTREMELY	1 TOO RISKY
3 POSSIBLE DANGER	1 DISASTER IF ANYTHING GOES WRONG	1 TOXIC LIQUIDS
3 RISKY	1 DISASTROUS	1 TOXIC WASTES
2 DANGER ZONES	1 EARTH IN DANGER	1 TOXICITY
2 EXPLODE	1 ENDANGER A LOT OF PEOPLE'S LIVES	1 TOXICS
2 HAZARDS	1 ERODED CONTAINERS	1 TREMENDOUS DANGER
2 NUCLEAR ACCIDENT	1 EXPOSING PEOPLE	1 UNSECURE
2 NUCLEAR DISASTER	1 FUTURE HAZARD	1 VERY HARMFUL
2 PEOPLE GETTING HURT	1 FUTURE TRAGEDY	1 VERY HAZARDOUS
2 POTENTIAL DANGER	1 GREAT HAZARD	1 VERY THREATENING
2 POTENTIAL DISASTER	1 HARM TO CHILDREN	1 WHOLE GROUND IS GOING TO BLOW UP
2 POTENTIAL HAZARD	1 HARM TO COUNTRY	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 1683 (16.83%)

I. NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES

b. Death / Sickness

306 DEATH	1 BABIES BEING BORN MUTATED	1 HEALTH PROBLEM
120 CANCER	1 BABIES WITH THREE HEADS	1 HEALTH RISK
42 SICKNESS	1 BAD FOR HEALTH, LETHAL	1 HIGH CANCER RISK
39 UNHEALTHY	1 BAD HEALTH PROBLEMS	1 ILL-HEALTH
31 DISEASE	1 BIRTH DEFECTS FROM LONG EXPOSURE	1 INCREASED DISEASE
22 ILLNESS	1 CANCEROUS	1 IT'S NOT GOOD FOR YOU
13 HEALTH HAZARD	1 CAUSE CANCER	1 KILL HUMAN BEINGS
12 BIRTH DEFECTS	1 CAUSES CANCER	1 KILLER
12 DISEASES	1 CHILDREN AND DEATH	1 CHILLING ALL OF US
9 DEATHS	1 CHILDREN, DYING	1 KILLING PEOPLE
8 DYING	1 DANGER TO HEALTH	1 KILLING US
7 SICK	1 DANGEROUS CANCER	1 KILLS
6 HEALTH PROBLEMS	1 DANGEROUS TO HEALTH	1 LETHAL DEATH
6 SICK PEOPLE	1 DEAD KIDS	1 LIFELESS
5 BAD FOR HEALTH	1 DEAD STUFF	1 MANY SIDE EFFECTS AND DISEASE
5 BURIAL	1 DEAD THINGS	1 MODERATE HEALTH PROBLEM
5 KILLING	1 DEAD TREES	1 MORE DEATH
5 MUTATIONS	1 DEATH AND SICKNESS	1 NERVOUS DISORDER
5 NO LIFE	1 DEATHLY	1 NO LIFE FORMS
4 DEAD	1 DEFORMED	1 NOT LIVE
4 DEFORMITIES	1 DEFORMED KIDS	1 PEOPLE COULD BECOME INFECTED
4 LEUKEMIA	1 DEFORMITIES IN BABIES	1 PEOPLE LOSING THEIR HAIR
4 MUTANTS	1 DEFORMITY	1 PEOPLE SICK
3 HAIR FALLING OUT	1 DEGENERATIVE	1 PEOPLE'S HEALTH
3 HEALTH HAZARDS	1 DESTROYING OUR HEALTH	1 PREMATURE DEATH
3 PEOPLE GETTING SICK	1 DETERIORATING HEALTH	1 RADIATION CANCER
2 BAD HEALTH	1 DIE	1 RESPIRATORY PROBLEMS
2 CANCER CAUSING	1 DISEASE CAUSER	1 RETARDED KIDS
2 DEAD PEOPLE	1 DISFIGUREMENT	1 ROTTING FLESH
2 DEFORMED CHILDREN	1 FATAL	1 SHORT HEALTH
2 HAZARDOUS TO HEALTH	1 FATALITIES	1 SHORT LIFE
2 HEALTH RISKS	1 GENETIC DAMAGE	1 SKIN DISEASE
2 INFECTION	1 GENETIC DEFECTS	1 SLOW DEATH
2 LESIONS	1 GRAVES	1 STERILITY
2 MUTATION	1 HAIR LOSS	1 TERRIBLE FOR HEALTH
2 NOT HEALTHY	1 HAZARD FOR HEALTH	1 TERRIBLE SICKNESS
2 PEOPLE DYING	1 HAZARDOUS TO YOUR HEALTH	1 THREATENING TO LIFE
2 POOR HEALTH	1 HEADACHES	1 UNHEALTHY CONDITIONS

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 783 (7.83%)

I. NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES

c. Environmental Damage

276	POLLUTION	1	DAMAGE TO OUR WATER SUPPLY	1	NEGATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
134	CONTAMINATION	1	DAMAGE, WATER	1	NON-ECOLOGICAL
20	WATER POLLUTION	1	DAMAGING THE WATER	1	NOT GOOD FOR THIS PLANET
13	WATER CONTAMINATION	1	DAMAGING TO ECOLOGY	1	POISON THE AIR
10	POLLUTION, WATER	1	DAMAGING TO ENVIRONMENT	1	POISON THE GROUND
8	CONTAMINATED WATER	1	DAMAGING TO WATER TABLE	1	POISON UNDERGROUND
7	LOVE CANAL	1	DANGER TO ANIMALS	1	POISON WATER
4	BAD WATER	1	DANGEROUS TO WATER	1	POISONING WATER
4	EROSION	1	DEAD ANIMALS	1	POLLUTE SURFACE PLANTS
3	BAD ENVIRONMENT	1	DEAD FISH	1	POLLUTED WATER TABLES
3	BAD FOR ENVIRONMENT	1	DEAD FLOWERS	1	POLLUTES THE GROUND
3	CONTAMINATION, WATER	1	DEAD PLANTS	1	POLLUTING
3	ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARD	1	DEAD RABBITS	1	POLLUTING AIR
3	POLLUTED	1	DEATH, PLANTS	1	POLLUTING GROUND WATER
3	POLLUTING WATER	1	DECAYING PLANTS	1	POLLUTING GROUND, WATER, AND PEOPLE
3	POLLUTION OF WATER	1	DESTROYING BEAUTIFUL SIGHTS	1	POLLUTING OF WATER
3	POLLUTION, AIR	1	DESTROYING ENVIRONMENT	1	POLLUTING SOIL
3	WATER, BAD	1	DESTROYING OUR ENVIRONMENT	1	POLLUTING THE LAND
2	BAD FOR NATURE	1	DESTRUCTION AND DAMAGE TO THE ECO-SYSTEM	1	POLLUTING THE WATER SUPPLY
2	BAD SOIL	1	DESTRUCTION OF ENVIRONMENT	1	POLLUTION AIR
2	CONTAMINATED	1	DESTRUCTION OF NATURE	1	POLLUTION IN THE EARTH
2	CONTAMINATING	1	DESTRUCTIVE TO WATER SUPPLY	1	POLLUTION OF H2O-WATER
2	CONTAMINATION OF THE GROUND	1	DIRECT POLLUTION	1	POLLUTION OF SOIL
2	CONTAMINATION OF WATER	1	DISPLACEMENT OF THE NATURAL HABITAT	1	POLLUTION OF THE AREA
2	DESTROYING NATURE	1	DOWNFALL OF ENVIRONMENT	1	POLLUTION OF THE ATMOSPHERE
2	DIRTY WATER	1	DYING ANIMALS	1	POLLUTION OF THE EARTH
2	ENVIRONMENTAL DESTRUCTION	1	DYING PLANTS	1	POLLUTION WATER
2	ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION	1	EARTHQUAKE OPENING WATER TABLE	1	POLLUTION, GROUND
2	ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS	1	ENDANGERS ANIMALS	1	POLLUTION, UNDERGROUND STREAMS
2	ENVIRONMENTALLY UNSAFE	1	ENDANGERS FLORA	1	POLLUTION, UNDERGROUND WATER
2	FORM OF POLLUTION	1	ENVIRONMENT, BAD	1	POSSIBLE CONTAMINATION
2	GROUND POLLUTION	1	ENVIRONMENT, POOR	1	RESOURCE POLLUTION
2	GROUND WATER CONTAMINATION	1	ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE	1	RISK THE ENVIRONMENT
2	HARMFUL TO ENVIRONMENT	1	ENVIRONMENTAL DEVASTATION	1	RUINED ECOLOGY
2	LAND POLLUTION	1	ENVIRONMENTAL DISASTER	1	RUINING THE SOIL
2	POLLUTED WATER	1	EROSION OF THE ENVIRONMENT	1	RUINING WATER
2	POLLUTION IN THE WATER	1	EVENTUAL GROUND CONTAMINATION	1	SILENT KILLERS (WATER)
1	ACID RAIN	1	FISH DYING	1	SMOG
1	AFFECT THE STREAMS	1	FOOD CONTAMINATED	1	SOIL (BAD)
1	ALL THE LAND WOULD BE NO GOOD	1	FOOD CONTAMINATION	1	SOIL DAMAGE
1	ANIMALS DYING	1	FORESTS BEING DESTROYED	1	SPOILED LAND
1	BAD AIR	1	FUTURE CONTAMINATION	1	TERRIBLE FOR WHOLE ENVIRONMENT
1	BAD DRINKING WATER	1	GROUND EROSION	1	TOXIC POLLUTION
1	BAD ENVIRONMENTAL	1	HARMFUL TO THE ENVIRONMENT	1	TOXIC WASTE SURFACING
1	BAD FOR WATER	1	HAZARD TO SEA LIFE	1	TREES DYING
1	BAD POLLUTION	1	HIGH POTENTIAL FOR CONTAMINATION	1	UNDERGROUND POLLUTION
1	BIG POLLUTION ISSUE	1	HOPE THEY DON'T POLLUTE THE WATER	1	UNDERGROUND WATER CONTAMINATION
1	BRINE MIGRATION	1	I DON'T KNOW HOW IT CAN NOT POLLUTE	1	UNHEALTHY ATMOSPHERE
1	CONTAMINATE GROUND WATER	1	INFILTRATE WATER SUPPLY	1	UNSAFE FOR ENVIRONMENT
1	CONTAMINATE THE WATER LEVEL	1	IT WILL GET IN OUR WATER AND FOOD	1	UNSAFE, ANIMALS
1	CONTAMINATED AREA	1	KILL PLANT LIFE	1	WAKE POLLUTION
1	CONTAMINATED MINERALS	1	KILL WILDLIFE	1	WATER (BAD)
1	CONTAMINATED SOIL	1	KILLING ANIMALS	1	WATER INFECTED
1	CONTAMINATES	1	KILLING PLANTS	1	WATER SUPPLY CONTAMINATION
1	CONTAMINATES AIR	1	KILLING WILDLIFE	1	WATER SUPPLY POLLUTED
1	CONTAMINATES THE WATER	1	LARGE DEAD PATCH LAND	1	WATER SYSTEMS SPREAD
1	CONTAMINATING THE WATER SUPPLY	1	LEACHING	1	WATER, DIRTY
1	CONTAMINATING WATER	1	LIQUID THAT WILL CONTAMINATE WATER	1	WHAT IT WILL DO TO THE ENVIRONMENT
1	CONTAMINATION OF ALL SORTS	1	MAJOR POLLUTION	1	WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN TO THE WATER
1	CONTAMINATION OF FOODS	1	MESSING UP THE CROPS	1	WILL IT AFFECT THE ATMOSPHERE
1	CONTAMINATION OF THE SOIL	1	MIGHT DAMAGE UNDERGROUND WATER	1	WOULD POLLUTE THE WATER
1	CONTAMINATION, GROUND	1	MUTANT PLANTS	1	WRECKING THE ENVIRONMENT
1	COULD CONTAMINATE WATER	1	NATURE IN DANGER		

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 692 (6.92%)

I. NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES

d. Leakage

106 LEAKAGE	1 GET INTO WATER SUPPLIES	1 POISON OF WATER LEAKAGE
24 SEEPAGE	1 GETS INTO WATER	1 POSSIBILITY FOR LEAKS
13 LEAKS	1 GETTING INTO THE WATER & FUCKING US UP	1 POSSIBLE LEAKAGE
9 SPILLAGE	1 GETTING INTO WATER	1 SEEP INTO WATER
7 LEAK	1 GROUND LEAKAGE	1 SEEPAGE COMING OUT
6 SPILLS	1 IT WOULD LEAK	1 SEEPAGE INTO WATER
3 LEAKING	1 IT'S GOING TO SEEP OUT	1 SEEPAGE INTO WATER TABLE
3 LEAKY BARRELS	1 LEAK INTO WATER SUPPLY	1 SEEPAGE, ATMOSPHERE
2 LEAKING BARRELS	1 LEAKAGE DANGER	1 SEEPING THROUGH
1 BARRELS DETERIORATE & WASTE SEEPS OUT	1 LEAKAGE IN AQUIFERS	1 SPILL
1 BREAKING OUT OF GROUND	1 LEAKAGE INTO GROUND WATER	1 SPILLAGE, CHEMICALS
1 CHECK FOR LEAKAGE	1 LEAKAGE INTO WATER SUPPLY	1 THINGS COMING UP OUT OF THE GROUND
1 COMES UP	1 LEAKAGE, SEEPAGE	1 WASTE WILL ESCAPE AND GET INTO GROUND
1 COMING OUT OF GROUND	1 LEAKAGE, WASTE	1 WATER, LEAKAGE
1 COMING TO SURFACE	1 LEAKAGE, WATER	1 WILL IT EVER COME UP
1 COULD IT BE SEALED SO NOTHING ESCAPES	1 LEAKING CONTAINERS	1 WOULD SCATTER WITH FLOOD
1 ERUPTS THROUGH EARTH	1 LEAKING INTO WATER	
1 EVENTUALLY LEAK	1 LEAKING SEWAGE	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 216 (2.16%)

e. Destruction

90 DESTRUCTION	4 DETRIMENTAL	1 DESTROYS SO MUCH
18 DESTRUCTIVE	3 DESTROYING	1 DESTROYS THE GROUND
7 DEVASTATION	2 LARGE SCALE DESTRUCTION	1 DESTRUCTION OF THE LANDSCAPE
4 DESTROY	1 DELAYED DESTRUCTION	1 DEVASTATING

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 133 (1.33%)

f. Pain and Suffering

5 PAIN	1 A LOT OF PAIN	1 PEOPLE SUFFERING
5 SUFFERING	1 AGONY	
4 PAINFUL	1 MISERY	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 18 (0.18%)

g. Uninhabitable

1 NO PEOPLE	1 NOTHING CAN GROW	1 YOU CAN'T LIVE THERE
1 NO VEGETATION	1 NOTHING LEFT	
1 NO WATER	1 UN-LIVABLE	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 7 (0.07%)

h. Local Repository Area Consequences

1 AREA THAT CAN NEVER BE USED AGAIN	1 LOCAL DAMAGE	1 UNBUILDABLE LAND
1 KILLING THE AREA OFF	1 NO FOOD PRODUCTS FROM THAT AREA	1 UNUSABLE LAND

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 6 (0.06%)

i. Negative Consequences - Other

1 CONTAMINATED CLOTHING	1 NO FRESH FOODS	1 STERILE FARM ANIMALS
1 HUMAN LIVES WASTED	1 NO MORE SUNSHINE	1 TOXIC MUTANTS
1 MIGHT CAUSE ANOTHER EARTHQUAKE	1 NO PLACE SAFE	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 8 (0.08%)

II. NEGATIVE

a. Bad / Negative

88	BAD	1	BAD FEELING	1	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE
45	NEGATIVE	1	BAD FEELINGS	1	NEGATIVE FEELINGS
39	TERRIBLE	1	BAD FOR OLD PEOPLE	1	NEGATIVE IN GENERAL
33	STUPID	1	BAD FOR PEOPLE	1	NEGATIVE THINGS
25	DIRTY	1	BAD FOR PEOPLE WHO LIVE THERE	1	NEGATIVE THOUGHTS
18	UGLY	1	BAD FOR PUBLIC	1	NO VALUE
17	NOT GOOD	1	BAD FOR SOCIETY	1	NONSENSE
17	UNDESIRABLE	1	BAD FOR US	1	NOT DESIRABLE
15	DISGUSTING	1	BAD FOR WORKERS	1	NOT GOOD FEELINGS
14	DON'T LIKE IT	1	BAD GROUND AND DIRT	1	NOT HIGHLY FOND OF IT
13	GROSS	1	BAD PLACE	1	NOT MUCH
11	DUMB	1	BAD SITUATION	1	NOT THRILLED
9	STUPIDITY	1	BAD STUFF	1	NOT TOO GOOD
9	YUCK	1	BAD THING	1	NOT TOO CRAZY ABOUT IT
8	DISLIKE	1	BAD THINGS	1	NOT TOO SMART
7	ANGER	1	BAD THOUGHTS	1	NOT VERY GOOD IMAGE
7	BAD NEWS	1	BAD, POTENTIALLY	1	NOT VERY NICE
7	MESS	1	BADNESS	1	NOT VERY POSITIVE
7	UNPLEASANT	1	BARBARIC	1	NOTHING GOOD
7	VERY NEGATIVE	1	BIG FUCKING CROCK OF SHIT	1	NUISANCE
6	CRAZY	1	BULL SHIT	1	OBJECTIONABLE
6	RIDICULOUS	1	CA-CA	1	OUCH
5	AWFUL	1	CRUD	1	PITEOUS
5	FILTH	1	DEFINITELY NEGATIVE	1	POOR
5	NASTY	1	DEPRESSION	1	PREPOSTEROUS
4	DEPRESSING	1	DETRIMENTAL TO EVERYBODY	1	PRETTY BAD
4	DISGUST	1	DEVASTATING TO ME	1	PRETTY LAME
4	DON'T CARE FOR IT	1	DISAPPOINTING	1	REPELLING
4	DON'T LIKE	1	DISGRACEFUL	1	REPUGNANT
4	HIDEOUS	1	DISSATISFACTION	1	REPULSED
4	I DON'T LIKE IT	1	DOESN'T LOOK RIGHT	1	REPULSION
4	NO GOOD	1	DOESN'T SOUND GOOD	1	RESENTFUL
4	SAD	1	DON'T LIKE THAT STUFF	1	ROTTEN
4	UNCLEAN	1	DRAG	1	SADNESS
3	BULLSHIT	1	DREADFUL	1	SATANISTIC
3	EVIL	1	EVERYTHING NEGATIVE	1	SCUM
3	HELL	1	EXTREMELY NEGATIVE	1	SHITTY
3	IT'S BAD	1	EYESORE	1	SICK STUFF
3	JUNK	1	FILTHY	1	SLOPPY
3	MESSY	1	FOOLISH	1	SOMETHING BAD
3	SHIT	1	GOOD FOR NOTHING	1	SOMETHING NEGATIVE
3	SICKENING	1	GOOEY	1	SOMETHING NOT GOOD
3	UNCOMFORTABLE	1	GRUESOME	1	SORROW
3	UNDESIREABLE	1	HATE IT	1	SORROWFUL
2	ABOMINATION	1	HATE THEM	1	SORRY
2	ANGRY PEOPLE	1	HATRED	1	STUPID TO HAVE
2	DESPAIR	1	HOPELESS	1	STUPIDITY, SHORT-TERM
2	DISTASTE	1	HOPELESS SITUATION	1	TERRIBLE THING TO DO
2	FRUSTRATION	1	HOPELESSNESS	1	TERRIBLE WHAT OUR WORLD HAS CREATED
2	I DON'T LIKE THE IDEA	1	HURT IMAGE OF THE AREA	1	TERRIBLE, DON'T LIKE IT
2	I HATE IT	1	HURTFUL	1	THEY'RE ALL NEGATIVE
2	INSANE	1	I DON'T LIKE	1	TOTALLY BAD SITUATION
2	INSANITY	1	I DON'T LIKE NUCLEAR	1	TOTALLY NEGATIVE
2	NOT HAPPY	1	I GET ANGRY	1	TOTALLY NEGATIVE REVULSION
2	NOT PLEASANT	1	I HATE THE THOUGHT OF IT	1	TURNS YOU OFF
2	NOT RIGHT	1	I WOULDN'T LIKE IT	1	UCK
2	NOT VERY GOOD	1	ICKY	1	UNENJOYABLE
2	PATHETIC	1	IDIOTIC	1	UNGODLY
2	REPULSIVE	1	ILLOGICAL	1	UNHAPPY PEOPLE
2	UNATTRACTIVE	1	IMMORAL	1	UNPLEASANTFUL
2	UNCIVILIZED	1	INTOLERABLE	1	UNPLEASANTNESS
2	UNETHICAL	1	IRRITATING	1	UNSANITARY
2	UNFORTUNATE	1	IT'S A PITY	1	UNSATISFACTORY
2	UNHAPPY	1	IT'S NEGATIVE	1	VERY BAD
2	UNINTELLIGENT	1	IT'S TERRIBLE	1	VERY BAD THING
2	UNSIGHTLY	1	IT'S UNETHICAL AND STUPID	1	VERY POOR THOUGHTS
1	A HELL	1	KIND OF IRKSOME	1	VULGAR
1	A MESS	1	LAME	1	WILL NOT LIKE IT
1	ABHORRENCE	1	MAKES ME MAD	1	WORSE
1	ANGRY	1	MAN IRRESPONSIBLE TO HIMSELF	1	YUCK!
1	ASININE	1	MAN'S STUPIDITY		
1	BAD BAD BAD	1	MESSY, DIRTY		

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 681 (6.81%)

II. NEGATIVE

b. Scary

107 SCARY	2 UNEASY	1 PEOPLE BEING SCARED OF IT
77 FEAR	1 A LITTLE FRIGHTENING IMAGE	1 PRETTY SCARY
35 FRIGHTENING	1 ALWAYS BE WORRIED	1 SCARE ME TO DEATH
26 HORRIBLE	1 DEEP CONCERN	1 SCARED OF THEM
15 SCARED	1 FEAR FOR NEW GENERATIONS	1 SCARED TO DEATH
11 CONCERN	1 FEAR OF DYING	1 SCARES ME IT WILL POLLUTE WATER
8 HORROR	1 FEAR OF LEAKS OR EXPLOSION	1 SCARES YOU
7 AFRAID	1 FEAR OF UNKNOWN CONSEQUENCES	1 SCARY FOR CHILDREN
6 FEARFUL	1 FOREBODING	1 SCARY THAT THEY DO IT
6 PANIC	1 FRIGHTFUL	1 SCARY THOUGHT
6 WORRY	1 GOOD GRIEF	1 SCARY, CHILDREN
5 CONCERNED	1 GOOD HEAVENS	1 SCREAMING PEOPLE
5 TERROR	1 HEAVEN HELP US	1 SOMETHING HORRIBLE
5 WORRIED	1 HOLY SHIT!	1 SOUNDS SPOOKY
4 APPREHENSION	1 HORRID	1 SPOOKS ME OUT
4 FRIGHTENED	1 HORRIFIED	1 SPOOKY
4 NERVOUS	1 I AM CONCERNED	1 UNEASINESS
4 SCARES ME	1 IT'S FEARFUL	1 UPSET
3 INSECURE	1 MISGIVINGS	1 UPSETTING
3 TERRIFYING	1 OH BOY	1 VERY SCARY
2 ANXIETY	1 OH GOD	1 WARY
2 FRIGHT	1 OH SHIT	1 WORRISOME
2 GENERAL CONCERN	1 OH, MY GOD!	1 WORRY ABOUT EFFECTS
2 HORRIFYING	1 OH, MY GOODNESS	1 WORRY ABOUT THE FUTURE
2 NIGHTMARE	1 OMINOUS	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 401 (4.01%)

c. Unnecessary / Opposed

41 UNNECESSARY	1 AGAINST IT PERIOD	1 NO-LIFE
20 UNWANTED	1 AVOIDABLE	1 NOT FAVOR IT
16 NO	1 CAN'T IMAGINE ANYONE WANTING ONE	1 NOT FOR ME
13 WRONG	1 DISAPPROVE	1 NOT HAVE IT
11 BAD IDEA	1 DO NOT BELIEVE IN IT	1 NOT IN FAVOR
9 WASTEFUL	1 DO WITHOUT IT	1 NOT LETTING IT HAPPEN
8 WASTE OF MONEY	1 DON'T APPROVE	1 NOT SOMETHING YOU WANT TO HAVE AROUND
7 USELESS	1 DON'T BELIEVE IN THEM	1 NOT TO BE DONE
6 UNACCEPTABLE	1 DON'T CARE FOR ONE	1 NOT TO DO IT
6 WASTE OF LAND	1 DON'T LIKE IDEA	1 NOT WANTED
5 AGAINST IT	1 DON'T LIKE THE IDEA	1 REAGAN WASTING THE MONEY
5 AVOID	1 DON'T SEE THE PURPOSE	1 SHOULDN'T BE ANY
5 DON'T WANT IT	1 DON'T THINK THERE SHOULD BE ANY	1 SHOULDN'T BE ANYWHERE
5 NOT A GOOD IDEA	1 DON'T WANT THEM	1 SHOULDN'T BE IN THE FIRST PLACE
5 NOT NECESSARY	1 DUMB IDEA	1 SHOULDN'T EVEN BE THERE
4 AGAINST	1 FIGHT	1 SHOULDN'T EXIST AROUND US
4 DON'T WANT	1 FIGHT IT WITH ANY LEGAL POWERS I HAVE	1 SHOULDN'T HAVE
3 DON'T NEED IT	1 I DON'T AGREE WITH IT AT ALL	1 SHOULDN'T HAVE THEM
3 GET RID OF IT	1 I DON'T LIKE THE IDEA AT ALL	1 THEY OUGHT TO DO AWAY WITH IT
3 NEEDLESS	1 I DON'T THINK IT SHOULD BE THERE	1 THEY SHOULD NOT EXIST
3 OPPOSED	1 I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD HAVE IT	1 THEY SHOULDN'T BE
3 OPPOSITION	1 I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD HAVE THEM	1 TO BE AVOIDED
3 SHOULDN'T BE	1 I DON'T WANT IT THERE	1 TO GET RID OF
2 DON'T AGREE	1 I DON'T WANT ONE ANYWHERE	1 TOTAL WASTE OF GOVERNMENT MONEY
2 I AM AGAINST IT	1 I DON'T WANT THEM	1 UNNECESSARY EVIL
2 I DON'T WANT IT	1 I VOTE AGAINST IT	1 UNNECESSARY THREAT TO HEALTH AND LIFE
2 NEVER	1 I WOULD NOT WANT IT	1 USELESSNESS
2 NOT FOR IT	1 I WOULD WANT NONE AT ALL	1 VERY FOOLISH, NO NEED
2 NOT IN FAVOR OF IT	1 I WOULDNT WANT IT ANYWHERE	1 VERY POOR IDEA
2 NOT NEEDED	1 I'M AGAINST IT	1 WASTE MONEY
2 SHOULD BE BANNED	1 I'M DEAD AGAINST IT	1 WASTE OF EVERYONE'S TIME
2 SHOULDN'T BE THERE	1 IT SHOULD BE ILLEGAL	1 WASTE OF TAX DOLLARS
2 SHOULDN'T DO IT	1 IT SHOULD NOT BE ANYWHERE	1 WASTE OF TIME
2 SHOULDN'T EXIST	1 IT SHOULDN'T BE	1 WASTE, TIME & MATERIAL
2 SHOULDN'T HAVE IT	1 IT'S UNCALLED FOR	1 WASTED MONEY
2 UNNEEDED	1 NO PART OF IT	1 WOULDN'T WANT
2 UNPROVEN	1 NO USE FOR IT	1 WOULDN'T WANT IT
2 WASTED LAND	1 NO WAY	
2 WE DON'T NEED IT	1 NO, DON'T WANT	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 296 (2.96%)

II. NEGATIVE

d. Not Near Me

25 FAR AWAY	1 DON'T WANT TO BE THERE	1 NOT WHERE I LIVE
8 WOULDN'T WANT TO LIVE NEAR ONE	1 FLIGHT OF PEOPLE AWAY	1 PEOPLE ARE MOVING AWAY
6 SOMEWHERE ELSE	1 GET AWAY	1 PLACE I DON'T WANT TO BE
5 AWAY FROM ME	1 GET AWAY FROM HERE	1 PLACE I WOULD NOT WANT TO BE
5 MOVE	1 GET FAR AWAY	1 PUT IT EAST OF THE ROCKIES
5 STAY AWAY	1 GET IT AWAY FROM US	1 PUT IT IN TEXAS
5 WOULDN'T WANT TO LIVE NEAR IT	1 GET IT OUT OF THE EARTH	1 PUT IT IN THAILAND
5 WOULDN'T WANT TO LIVE THERE	1 GIVE IT TO RUSSIANS	1 PUT IT ON ANOTHER PLANET
4 AWAY	1 GLAD IT'S NOT NEAR US	1 PUT IT SOMEWHERE ELSE
4 DON'T WANT IT HERE	1 HOPE WE NEVER HAVE ONE AROUND HERE	1 PUT ON MOON
4 MOVING	1 I DON'T WANT IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD	1 REASON WE LEFT ARIZONA
4 NOT HERE	1 I DON'T WANT THEM NEAR ME	1 RELOCATION
4 WOULDN'T WANT TO BE THERE	1 I DON'T WANT TO BE AROUND IT	1 SEND IT TO ANOTHER PLANET
3 DON'T WANT IT NEAR ME	1 I HOPE IT'S NOT NEXT DOOR	1 SEND IT TO CALIFORNIA
3 I DON'T WANT TO BE NEAR IT	1 I WANT IT FAR AWAY FROM LONG BEACH	1 SEND IT TO OUTER SPACE
3 NOT AROUND ME	1 I WOULD MOVE	1 SEND TO RUSSIA OR CUBA
3 WOULDN'T WANT IT NEAR ME	1 I WOULDN'T WANT IT IN MY BACKYARD	1 SENT TO MOON
3 WOULDN'T WANT TO BE NEAR ONE	1 I WOULDN'T WANT TO BE AROUND IT	1 SHIP TO RUSSIA
3 WOULDN'T WANT TO LIVE NEAR	1 I WOULDN'T WANT TO BE NEAR IT	1 SHOT OFF IN SPACE
2 AVOIDANCE	1 I WOULDN'T WANT TO BE THERE	1 SHOULD BE A LONG WAY AWAY
2 DON'T WANT TO BE NEAR IT	1 I WOULDN'T WANT TO LIVE NEAR ONE	1 SHOULD BE IN SIBERIA
2 DON'T WANT TO LIVE NEAR IT	1 IN A DIFFERENT STATE THEN WHERE I LIVE	1 SHOULDN'T BE HERE
2 DON'T WANT TO LIVE THERE	1 IT SHOULD BE IN OUTER SPACE	1 SOME OTHER STATE
2 FAR AWAY AS POSSIBLE	1 KEEP AWAY	1 SOME PLACE FAR AWAY
2 FAR AWAY FROM ME	1 KEEP IT AWAY	1 SOMEONE ELSE'S STATE
2 I DON'T WANT IT NEAR ME	1 KEEP IT AWAY FROM ME	1 SOMETHING I DON'T WANT NEAR ME
2 I WOULDN'T WANT IT NEAR ME	1 KEEP IT OUT OF MY YARD	1 SOMETHING I WOULD AVOID
2 I WOULDN'T WANT TO LIVE NEAR IT	1 KEEP IT OUT THERE	1 SOMETHING I WOULDN'T WANT TO BE AROUND.
2 I WOULDN'T WANT TO LIVE THERE	1 KEEP OUT OF THIS COUNTRY	1 SOMEWHERE AWAY FROM ME
2 MOVING AWAY	1 LONG WAYS FROM FLORIDA	1 STORE IT IN NEW MEXICO
2 NOT IN MY BACKYARD	1 MOVE AWAY	1 STORED SOMEPLACE ELSE
2 NOT IN MY STATE	1 NO DESIRE TO BE CLOSE	1 TO GET FAR AWAY FROM IT AS POSSIBLE
2 NOT LIVE NEAR	1 NOT A GOOD PLACE TO LIVE	1 TO THE MOON
2 NOT LIVE THERE	1 NOT AROUND HERE	1 WANT IT TO BE SOMEPLACE ELSE
2 NOT NEAR ME	1 NOT AROUND HERE!	1 WANT TO BE FAR FROM IT
2 NOT WANTING TO LIVE THERE	1 NOT BE NEAR IT	1 WANT TO STAY AWAY FROM IT
2 SHOOT INTO SPACE	1 NOT BE THERE	1 WOULD NOT LIVE NEAR IT
2 WOULDN'T LIVE THERE	1 NOT CLOSE TO ME	1 WOULD NOT WANT TO LIVE NEAR
1 ANOTHER STATE	1 NOT GO THERE	1 WOULDN'T BE NEAR IT
1 ARIZONA A GOOD CHOICE	1 NOT HERE, I HOPE	1 WOULDN'T LIKE TO HAVE IT IN MY BACKYARD
1 DIDN'T WANT TO LIVE NEAR IT	1 NOT IN CALIFORNIA	1 WOULDN'T WANT IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD
1 DO NOT DEPOSIT IN ALABAMA	1 NOT IN KENTUCKY	1 WOULDN'T WANT IT AROUND
1 DON'T BRING IT HERE	1 NOT IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD	1 WOULDN'T WANT IT BY ME
1 DON'T LIVE AROUND THAT AREA	1 NOT IN UNITED STATES	1 WOULDN'T WANT IT HERE
1 DON'T LIVE BY IT	1 NOT LIVE BY	1 WOULDN'T WANT IT IN OUR STATE
1 DON'T LIVE CLOSE TO IT	1 NOT LIVE NEAR IT	1 WOULDN'T WANT IT NEXT DOOR
1 I DON'T LIVE THERE	1 NOT LIVING THERE	1 WOULDN'T WANT IT NEXT TO ME
1 DON'T PUT IT HERE	1 NOT NEAR	1 WOULDN'T WANT IT WHERE I LIVE
1 DON'T WANT IT AROUND HERE	1 NOT NEAR MY HOUSE	1 WOULDN'T WANT ONE NEAR ME
1 DON'T WANT IT IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD	1 NOT NEXT TO ME	1 WOULDN'T WANT TO BE AROUND IT
1 DON'T WANT IT NEAR HOUSE	1 NOT ON THIS PLANET	1 WOULDN'T WANT TO BE CLOSE
1 DON'T WANT TO BE AROUND	1 NOT SPEND TIME THERE	1 WOULDN'T WANT TO BE CLOSE TO ONE
1 DON'T WANT TO BE AROUND ONE	1 NOT TO GO NEAR	1 WOULDN'T WANT TO LIVE BY ONE
1 DON'T WANT TO BE NEAR ONE	1 NOT UNDER ME	1 WOULDN'T WANT TO LIVE CLOSE
1 DON'T WANT TO BE THERE	1 NOT WANT IT IN PHOENIX	1 WOULDN'T WANT TO LIVE NEAR THERE
1 DON'T WANT TO LIVE IN NEIGHBORHOOD	1 NOT WANTING TO BE AROUND THEM	1 WOULDN'T WANT TO LIVE NEARBY
1 DON'T WANT TO LIVE NEAR	1 NOT WANTING TO LIVE NEAR IT	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 273 (2.73%)

II. NEGATIVE

e. War / Annihilation

40 WAR	1 DESTROYING THE EARTH	1 NUCLEAR ATTACK
10 NUCLEAR WAR	1 DESTRUCTION OF THE UNIVERSE	1 NUCLEAR ATTACKS
8 HOLOCAUST	1 DISINTEGRATION	1 PLANETARY DESTRUCTION
6 END OF WORLD	1 DUCK AND COVER	1 POSSIBLE DEVASTATION OF THE POPULATION
5 HIROSHIMA	1 END OF EARTH	1 PRIME TARGET
4 END OF THE WORLD	1 END OF THE SPECIES	1 THE END OF THE WORLD
4 MUSHROOM CLOUD	1 EVERYBODY DEAD	1 TOTAL DEVASTATION
2 ANNIHILATION	1 EVERYONE DYING	1 TOTAL DISASTER
2 BOMB SHELTER	1 EXTINCTION	1 ULTIMATE DOOM
2 THE END	1 KILLING RACE	1 WAR!
2 WARS	1 MAJOR DESTRUCTION OF THE EARTH	1 WE'RE GOING TO DIE
1 "THE BOMB"	1 MAN WILL DESTROY EARTH & BLAME GOD	1 WHOLE STATES DISINTEGRATING
1 ALAS BABYLON	1 MANY DEAD	1 WILL KILL OUR PLANET
1 ATOMIC BOOM	1 MASS EXTINCTION	1 WORLD DESTRUCTION
1 BOMB SHELTERS	1 MUSHROOM CLOUDS	1 WORLD GONE IN A COUPLE OF DECADES
1 DEATH OF THE EARTH	1 NAGASAKI	1 WORLD WAR III
1 DESTROYING HUMAN RACE	1 NOBODY LEFT	
1 DESTROYING RACE	1 NOT...WE'LL BE GONE SOON	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 126 (1.26%)

f. Societally Unpopular

6 PROTEST	1 COMMUNITY PULLING TOGETHER IN PROTEST	1 PROTEST, ACTAVIST
6 PROTESTS	1 COMMUNITY UPSET	1 PROTESTERS
3 UNPOPULAR	1 DEMONSTRATING	1 PROTESTING
2 DEMONSTRATIONS	1 DEMONSTRATION	1 PUBLIC DISMAY
2 NO ONE WANTS IT	1 DEMONSTRATION AGAINST	1 REVOLT
2 NOBODY WANTS IT	1 EVERYONE WANTS TO GET RID OF IT	1 STATES IN EAST ARE AGAINST IT
2 PROTESTORS	1 HOT POTATO NOBODY WANTS	
1 ABOMINABLE POLITICALLY	1 NOBODY WANTS THEM	
1 BIG BIT OF SOMETHING NO ONE WANTS	1 POPULATION UPPOAR	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 41 (0.41%)

g. Crime and Corruption

5 CRIME	1 BRIBERY	1 LYING
4 COVER-UPS	1 CORRUPT	1 MAFIA
3 CORRUPTION	1 CRIME INCREASE	1 POLITICS, CROOKED
3 COVER-UP	1 DECEIT	1 PULL THE WOOL OVER OUR EYES
3 ILLEGAL	1 GOVERNMENT COVER UP	1 SHADY
3 LIES	1 GOVERNMENT FRAUD	1 SNEAKY
2 GREED	1 GREEDY	1 UNLAWFUL
1 AGAINST THE LAW	1 LARCENY	1 WHITE COLLAR CRIME

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 40 (0.40%)

h. Decay / Slime / Smell

9 SMELL	2 DECAYING	1 GREEN SLUDGE
6 DECAY	2 STENCH	1 ODOR
4 SLIME	2 STINKY	1 SMELL WILL COME UP
4 SMELLY	1 BIG SLIME POOL	1 SPOILAGE
3 SLUDGE	1 GREEN SLIME	1 STINKS

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 39 (0.39%)

i. Darkness / Emptiness

17 DARK	3 NOTHINGNESS	1 DARKNESS
9 BLACK	2 BLACKNESS	1 EMPTY
3 BLEAK	1 BLACK HOLE	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 37 (0.37%)

II. NEGATIVE

j. Negative Toward Decision Makers and Process

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| 5 MISMANAGEMENT | 1 IRRESPONSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT/BUSINESS | 1 SHOULD HAVE BEEN DEALT WITH BEFORE |
| 2 NEGLIGENCE | 1 IRRESPONSIBLE | 1 SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE IN 70'S |
| 1 CAN'T TRUST PEOPLE | 1 IRRESPONSIBLE PEOPLE | 1 SHOULD HAVE THOUGHT ABOUT THAT IN 1945 |
| 1 CONCERNED ABOUT LONG TERM GOALS | 1 KEEP US MORE INFORMED | 1 THEY DON'T CARE WHO GETS SICK FROM IT |
| 1 GOVERNMENT IS NOT FACING UP TO ERRORS | 1 LACK OF CONSIDERATION | 1 THEY DON'T CARE WHO THEY KILL |
| 1 GOVERNMENT ISN'T DOING ANYTHING | 1 LACK OF CONSIDERATION FOR FUTURE | 1 THEY NEED TO UPDATE |
| 1 GOVERNMENT NOT LEARNING FROM MISTAKES | 1 MISTRUST | 1 UNTRUSTING |
| 1 I DON'T TRUST THEM | 1 NATIONS TRYING TO PICK UP PIECES | 1 UNTRUSTWORTHY |
| 1 IRRESPONSIBILITY | 1 SHORTSIGHTEDNESS | 1 WORRY ABOUT MANAGEMENT |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 32 (0.32%)

k. Commands to Not Build or to Eliminate Them

- | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 3 STOP | 1 DON'T | 1 RID OF IT |
| 2 DO AWAY WITH IT | 1 DON'T DO IT | 1 SHOULD BE CLOSED DOWN |
| 2 DON'T BUILD IT | 1 GET RID OF | 1 SHUT IT DOWN |
| 2 GET RID OF THEM | 1 GET THEM OUT OF HERE | 1 STOP IT |
| 1 ABOLISH | 1 PUT OUT OF BUSINESS | 1 STOP THOSE REPOSITORIES |
| 1 BAN IT | 1 QUIT IT | |
| 1 DOING AWAY WITH IT | 1 QUIT MAKING USE OF IT | |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 24 (0.24%)

Wrong or Bad Solution

- | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 4 QUESTIONABLE | 1 INEFFECTIVE | 1 QUESTIONABLE SOLUTION FOR PROBLEM |
| 1 BAD PLAN | 1 INEFFICIENT | 1 UNRELIABLE |
| 1 ENERGY, MISPLACED | 1 NO ANSWER TO ANYTHING | 1 WON'T WORK |
| 1 ILL-ADVISED | 1 NOT WELL THOUGHT OUT | 1 WRONG ALLEY |
| 1 IMPRACTICAL | 1 POOR PLANNING | |
| 1 INCORRECT | 1 POOR USE OF FUNDS | |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 19 (0.19%)

m. No Nuclear, Stop Producing

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| 2 NO MORE | 1 FIND A WAY TO ELIMINATE | 1 STOP MAKING IT |
| 2 NO NUCLEAR | 1 NOT BIG ON NUCLEAR | 1 STOP USING UNTIL WE CAN NEUTRALIZE IT |
| 1 AGAINST NUCLEAR WASTE | 1 NOT DO IT ANYMORE | 1 WE SHOULDN'T HAVE NUCLEAR ANYTHING |
| 1 DO AWAY WITH NUCLEAR WEAPONS | | |
| 1 DO AWAY WITH NUKES | 1 STOP BUILDING PLANTS | |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 15 (0.15%)

n. Unjust

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 3 INHUMANE | 1 EXPLOITATION | 1 NO RIGHT |
| 3 UNFAIR | 1 EXPLOITATIONS | 1 SHOULD BE AGAINST LAW |
| 1 CRIME AGAINST SOCIETY | ----- | |
| 1 CRUELTY | 1 IT OUGHT TO BE AGAINST THE LAW | |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 14 (0.14%)

o. Violence

- | | | |
|--------------|------------|---------------|
| 2 MURDER | 2 VICIOUS | 1 MASS MURDER |
| 2 TERRORISTS | 2 VIOLENCE | 1 TERRORISM |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 10 (0.10%)

II. NEGATIVE

p. Prohibited

2 PROHIBITED

1 FORBIDDEN

1 NOT ALLOWED

1 WE'RE NOT SUPPOSED TO HAVE IT

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 5 (0.05%)

q. Negative - Other

1 AGAINST NATURE

1 DEAD MEAT

1 DEADLY FORCE

1 DEATH THOUGHTS IN SOCIETY

1 FEAR PEOPLE

1 FIRE & BRIMSTONE

1 FORBIDDING

1 HORRIBLE FOR ONE PLACE

1 I DON'T LIKE THINGS I DON'T KNOW ABOUT

1 INCONVENIENT

1 MESS UP THINGS

1 NEVER PUT IN THE RIGHT PLACE

1 NOT AT ALL

1 POOR USE OF ENVIRONMENT

1 TERRIBLE FOR PEOPLE WHO LIVE NEARBY

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 15 (0.15%)

III. LOCATIONS

a. Non-Nevada Locations

36 NEW MEXICO	1 ARCO, IDAHO	1 OAK RIDGE
31 ARIZONA	1 ARKANSAS	1 OHIO
16 PALO VERDE	1 BUCKEYE ARIZONA	1 OUTER SPACE
15 UTAH	1 BY SAN DIEGO	1 PANAMA
11 DENVER	1 CALIFORNIA CITIES	1 POWER PLANT IN ARIZONA
10 CALIFORNIA	1 CARLSBAD CAVERNS	1 ROCKY FLAT
8 COLORADO	1 CARLSBAD, NEW MEXICO	1 ROCKY FLATS
7 RUSSIA	1 CHICAGO	1 ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL
5 PHOENIX	1 CINCINNATI, OHIO	1 ROCKY MOUNTAIN FLATS
4 HANFORD, WASHINGTON	1 COLORADO MOUNTAINS	1 SAN DIEGO
4 TEXAS	1 DAKOTAS	1 SAN ONOFRE
3 ALBUQUERQUE	1 DIABLO POWER PLANT	1 SAVANA RIVER PLANT IN GEORGIA
3 HANFORD	1 FLORIDA	1 SEABROOK
3 WASHINGTON	1 GULF OF NEW MEXICO	1 SEABROOK, MASSACHUSETTS
3 WASHINGTON STATE	1 HANFORD, WASHINGTON REPOSITORY	1 SOUTH AFRICA
3 WHITE SANDS	1 HOUSTON	1 SOUTHERN UTAH
3 WYOMING	1 IDAHO	1 SOVIET UNION
2 CANADA	1 IDAHO HAS ONE	1 STATE OF OHIO
2 KANSAS	1 ILLINOIS	1 TRI-CITIES AREA
2 LOS ALAMOS	1 IN ANTARCTICA	1 TROJAN
2 MIDWEST	1 IRAN	1 UTAH IS THE BEST PLACE
2 NEW YORK	1 LOS ALTOS	1 VIETNAM
2 PENNSYLVANIA	1 LOUISIANA	1 VIRGINIA
2 SOUTH CAROLINA	1 MICHIGAN	1 WALLA WALLA
2 TUCSON	1 MOJAVE	1 WESTERN ARIZONA
2 WASHINGTON, D.C.	1 MOON	1 WHIP PROJECT IN CARLSBAD
1 ALABAMA	1 NEW JERSEY	1 WHITE PLAINS
1 ALASKA	1 NEW MEXICO WOULD BE GOOD	1 WHITE SANDS, NEW MEXICO
1 ALBUQUERQUE AIR FORCE BASE	1 NEW MEXICO-COAST/GULF	
1 AMERICA	1 NIAGARA FALLS	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 245 (2.45%)

b. Storage Location / Containers

24 STORAGE	1 BIG BUILDING	1 HUGE CAVERNS
24 UNDERGROUND	1 BIG BUILDING IN MIDDLE OF DESERT	1 HUGE DOME
20 LOCATION	1 BIG CANS THAT ARE SEALED	1 HUGE UNDERGROUND STORAGE
	1 BIG CAVERN	1 LARGE CAVERN
9 DEEP	1 BIG CONCRETE BOX	1 LEAD BASEMENT, HOLE
8 CONTAINMENT	1 BIG DRUMS	1 LIKE A MINE SHAFT
6 CAVE	1 BIG HOLE IN GROUND	1 LIKE A VAULT
6 TUNNELS	1 BIG HOLE IN THE GROUND	1 METAL DRUMS-STORAGE
5 CAVERNS	1 BIG HOLE ON THE GROUND	1 MINE FOR STORAGE
5 CONTAINERS	1 BIG HOLES	1 ONE BUILT INTO A CAVE
5 SALT MINES	1 BIG SHAFT	1 PIPELINES
5 TUNNEL	1 BIG TANKS	1 PIPES
4 CAVERN	1 BIG UNDERGROUND SILO	1 PIT
4 MINES	1 CANISTER	1 PUTTING IN INTO MOUNTAINSIDES
4 SALT MINE	1 CAVERNOUS HOLE	1 SALT CAVES
4 VAULT	1 CAVERNS, UNDERGROUND	1 SALT DOMES
3 ROCK	1 CAVES	1 SALT TUNNELS IN LOUISIANA
2 BIG CAVE	1 CONTAINER TO HOLD IT	1 SHAFT
2 BIG CONTAINERS	1 CYLINDERS	1 SHAFT WITH CAVE AT BOTTOM
2 BIG HOLE	1 DARK CAVE	1 SHOT IN ROCKET
2 CANS	1 DEEP CAVERNS	1 SILO
2 CANISTERS	1 DEEP CAVERNS FOR BURYING	1 SOMETHING SIMILAR TO A PIPE LINE
2 CONTAINER	1 DEEP CAVERNS WITH BIG SILOS	1 SOUTHEAST CAVERNS
2 DEEP HOLE	1 DEEP MINES	1 STORAGE CANS
2 HOLE	1 DEEP PIT	1 STORING
2 MINESHAFT	1 DEEP TUNNEL	1 SUBMARINES
2 SALT DOME	1 DEEP UNDERGROUND	1 TANKS
2 SILOS	1 DRUMS	1 UNDERGROUND CANYON
2 SOMEWHERE TO PUT IT	1 DRUMS FOR STORAGE	1 UNDERGROUND CATACOMBS
1 50 GALLON DRUMS	1 DRUMS UNDER GROUND	1 UNDERGROUND LABYRINTH
1 A ROOM FULL OF CANS	1 GIANT CONCRETE SILOS	1 UNDERGROUND TUNNELS
1 USE ABANDONED MINES FOR STORAGE	1 GIGANTIC BASEMENTS 750	1 WASTE CONTAINERS
1 ABOVE GROUND	1 HOLE IN GROUND	1 WHITE SALT MINE
1 BARRELS UNDER THE GROUND	1 HOLE IN THE GROUND	
1 BIG BARREL IN GROUND	1 HOLES IN THE GROUND	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 243 (2.43%)

III. LOCATION

c. Desert / Barren

123 DESERT	1 BARREN ZONE	1 OPEN
22 DESOLATE	1 DESERT AREA	1 OPEN LAND
17 BARREN	1 DESERT AREA PREFERABLY	1 OPEN SPACE
12 DESOLATION	1 DESERT STATES	1 PRETTY BARREN
9 WASTELAND	1 DESOLATE LAND	1 SAND, DESERT, BARENESS
4 DESERTS	1 EMPTY AREA	1 SOMEPLACE OUT IN THE DESERT
3 BARREN LAND	1 EMPTY PLACE	1 SOMEWHERE IN DESERT
3 NOT POPULATED	1 FLAT OPEN AREA	1 SPARSE
3 VAST	1 I HOPE IT'S IN THE DESERT	1 THE DESERT
2 OPEN SPACES	1 IN DESERT	1 VACANT LAND
2 WIDE OPEN SPACES	1 IN THE DESERT	1 VAST DESERT
1 ARID ENVIRONMENT	1 LARGE AREA	1 VAST LAND
1 BARREN AREA	1 LARGE OPEN SPACE	1 WASTELAND PLACE
1 BARREN DESERT	1 LARGE OPEN SPACES	1 WASTELANDS
1 BARREN LANDSCAPE	1 LIKE A DESERT, NOTHING THERE	1 WIDE OPEN
1 BARREN WASTE LAND	1 LOCATED IN DESERT	1 WIDE OPEN SPACE

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 237 (2.37%)

d. Nevada / Las Vegas

155 NEVADA	1 CLOSE TO LAS VEGAS	1 POOR, POOR NEVADA
29 YUCCA MT	1 MIDDLE OF NEVADA DESERT	1 PUT IT IN THE DESERT IN NEVADA
20 LAS VEGAS	1 NEVADA DUMPING	1 PUT ONE UNDER LAS VEGAS
3 NEVADA DESERT	1 NEVADA IS A GOOD PLACE	1 THE STATE OF NEVADA
2 NEVADA TEST SITE	1 NEVADA BRATV	1 VEGAS
1 AREAS OF NEVADA		
1 BEATTY	1 NYE COUNTY	1 YUCCA, TONOPAH
1 CALIENTE	1 ONE UP IN NEVADA	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 227 (2.27%)

e. Waste / Garbage / Dumps

80 WASTE	2 DUMPS	1 SEWAGE SYSTEM
27 NUCLEAR WASTE	2 LANDFILL	1 SEWERS
25 GARBAGE	2 SEWAGE	1 TOXIC DUMP
18 DUMP	2 SEWER	1 TRASH CAN IN GROUND
8 TRASH	2 WASTE PRODUCTS	1 UNDERGROUND DUMPING
5 RADIOACTIVE WASTE	1 A DUMP	1 UNDERGROUND FULL OF TRASH
3 DUMPING	1 DUMP SITE, OVERGROWN	1 UNDERGROUND GARBAGE CAN
3 DUMP SITE	1 ILLEGAL DUMPING GROUNDS	1 UNDERGROUND SEWAGE REPOSITORY
3 GARBAGE DUMP	1 LAND DUMPSTER	1 UNDERGROUND STORAGE
3 HAZARDOUS WASTE	1 LANDFILLS FOR GARBAGE	1 WASTE PIT
3 WASTES		
2 ATOMIC WASTE	1 LOTS OF GARBAGE	1 WASTE, UNDERGROUND
2 DUMP SITES	1 MORE GARBAGE	
2 DUMPING GROUND	1 NUCLEAR WASTE DUMPS IN UNITED STATES	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 215 (2.15%)

III. LOCATION

f. Isolated

13 ISOLATED	1 AWAY FROM POPULATION	1 NON-POPULATED
8 ISOLATION	1 DESERTED AREA, DESOLATE	1 NOT NEAR URBAN AREAS
5 AWAY FROM PEOPLE	1 DESERTED ISLAND	1 PUT IT WHERE NO ONE ELSE IS
5 DESERTED	1 DESERTED PLACE	1 PUT OUT SOMEWHERE UNINHABITED
5 REMOTE	1 DESOLATE AREA, REMOTE AREA	1 REMOTE AREAS
5 UNPOPULATED	1 DO IT FAR AWAY FROM PEOPLE	1 REMOTE HANDLING
4 HIDDEN	1 DUMP IN OCEAN AWAY FROM PEOPLE	1 REMOTE HOPEFULLY
4 SECLUDED	1 FAR AWAY FROM HUMANS	1 REMOTE SITE
3 DESOLATE AREA	1 FAR FROM POPULATED AREAS	1 SECLUDED-WANT IT TO BE
3 DISTANT	1 GET IT FAR AWAY FROM CIVILIZATION	1 SECLUSION
2 NOT POPULATED AREA	1 HOUSING DEVELOPMENT NONE NEAR	1 SHOULD BE DESOLATE PLACE
2 REMOTE AREA	1 I WANT IT AWAY FROM THE POPULATION	1 SHOULDN'T BE AROUND PEOPLE
2 UNINHABITED	1 IN THE MIDDLE OF NOWHERE	1 SHOULDN'T BE CLOSE TO ANYTHING
1 A PLACE THAT IS NOT CLOSE TO HABITATION	1 ISOLATED AREA	1 UNPOPULATED AREA
1 ABANDONED AREA	1 ISOLATED, BARREN AREA	1 VACATED AREA
1 AREA WHERE THERE ARE FEW PEOPLE	1 LOCATED IN REMOTE, SAFE PLACE	1 VERY LOW POPULATION
1 AS FAR AWAY FROM CIVILIZATION	1 LOW POPULATION AREA	1 VERY REMOTE
1 AWAY FROM	1 NEED AWAY FROM POPULATED AREAS	1 WANT IT SECLUDED
1 AWAY FROM CITIES	1 NEEDS TO BE IN A DESOLATE AREA	1 WILDERNESS, AWAY FROM PEOPLE
1 AWAY FROM EVERYTHING	1 NEEDS TO BE ISOLATED	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 107 (1.07%)

g. Facilities and Their Construction

12 CONCRETE	1 ELEVATORS	1 LOTS OF CONCRETE
11 DIRT	1 FACILITIES	1 MASSIVE
5 BIG	1 FACILITY	1 METAL
4 LARGE	1 FOUNDATION	1 PUTTING UP A SITE
2 BUILDING	1 GIGANTIC	1 ROCK STRUCTURE
2 BUILDINGS	1 GLASS	1 SOLID ROCK
2 CEMENT	1 GRANITE	1 STEEL DOORS
2 STEEL	1 HEAVY CEMENT	1 STEEL WALLS
2 STORAGE FACILITY	1 LARGE METALLIC	1 STEEL WALLS UNDERGROUND
1 BIG TRAP DOORS	1 LEAD SHIELDING	1 STRUCTURE
1 CRANES LOWERING	1 LEAD WALLS	1 TUNNELING THRU A MOUNTAIN IN NEVADA

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 66 (0.66%)

h. Bury It

6 DEPTH	1 BURY UNDERGROUND	1 IT BETTER BE DEEP
3 BURIED	1 BURY WASTES	1 NOT DEEP ENOUGH
1 BUNCH A JUNK BURIED	1 BURYING WASTE	1 SOME PLACE TO BURY WASTE
1 BURIED DEEP	1 DIG A HOLE	1 STORE DEEP ENOUGH
1 BURIED WASTE	1 DIG DEEPER	1 STORED UNDERGROUND
1 BURY	1 DIGGING	1 THANK GOD ITS UNDERGROUND
1 BURY IT	1 DRIVING HOLE	1 UNDERGROUND WOULD BE FUSITIVE
1 BURY IT DEEP	1 I HOPE IT'S DEEP	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 30 (0.30%)

i. Locations - Other

2 SOUTHWEST	1 NEVADA & ARIZONA DESERT-BEST PLACES	1 PUT WHERE NO PROBLEMS
1 IN THE OCEAN	1 NEVADA AND NEW MEXICO	1 SANDID MOUNTAINS
1 JACKASS FLATS	1 PLACE TO GET RID OF IT	1 UNDERGROUND GARAGE
1 LOCATION?	1 PLACE TO STORE IT	1 UNDERGROUND SHELTER
1 LOCATIONS	1 PLACE TO STORE NUCLEAR	1 WOULDN'T WANT PEOPLE TO KNOW WHERE
1 MOUNTAIN AREA	1 PLACE WHERE STORE NUCLEAR WASTE	
1 NEVADA AND ARIZONA	1 PUT IN MIDDLE OF CRIME DISTRICTS	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 20 (0.20%)

IV. RADIATION, PHYSICAL STATES

a. Radiation / Nuclear

197 RADIATION	1 GLOW	
35 RADIOACTIVITY	1 GLOW IN DARK	1 NUCLEAR WRAP
23 RADIOACTIVE	1 GLOWING EARTH	1 NUKE
16 NUCLEAR	1 GLOWING POPULATION	1 NUKE PARTICLES
5 PLUTONIUM	1 HAZARD OF RADIATION	1 NUKES
4 GLOW IN THE DARK	1 I PICTURE THE TALL REACTORS	1 OVERHEATED NUCLEAR REACTOR
3 GLOWING	1 MEN WITH FUNNY RADIATION SUITS ON	1 PEOPLE GLOWING
3 HALF LIFE	1 MUSHROOM BOMB	1 RADIATION LEAK
3 REACTORS	1 NUCLEAR CONTAMINATES	1 RADIATION SICKNESS
3 URANIUM	1 NUCLEAR DUMP	1 RADIATION, SPREADING
2 HALF-LIFE	1 NUCLEAR MELTDOWN	1 RADIATIONS
2 RADIOACTIVITY	1 NUCLEAR PRODUCTS	1 RADIOACTIVE FOOD
2 RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL	1 NUCLEAR RADIATION	1 RADIOACTIVE RESIDUE
1 ATOMIC	1 NUCLEAR RESEARCH	1 RADIOACTIVE SEEPAGE
1 BETA RAYS	1 NUCLEAR SIGHTS	1 RADIOACTIVE SOIL
1 DEGREE OF RADIATION	1 NUCLEAR STORAGE	1 RADIOACTIVE SUITS
1 FISSION	1 NUCLEAR TREE	1 RADIOACTIVE SYMBOL
		1 REACTOR

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 336 (3.36%)

b. Chemicals & Physical States (Liquids, Gases)

19 CHEMICALS	1 BAD CHEMICALS	1 LIQUID
6 VOLATILE	1 BUBBLING LIQUID	1 METHANE GAS
5 FUMES	1 BUBBLING LIQUIDS	1 POISONOUS GASES
4 GAS	1 CARBON MONOXIDE	1 STORED CHEMICALS
3 MERCURY	1 CHEMICAL PLANT	1 VAPORS
2 RADON GAS	1 CHEMICALS, BAD	1 VOLATILE
1 ACID	1 CHEMICALS, HARMFUL	
1 ACIDS	1 GASES	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 55 (0.55%)

c. Fire / Hot

10 HEAT	2 SMOKE	1 FLAMES
9 FIRE	1 BURNING	1 HEAT EMANATING FROM IT
3 BURNS	1 FIRE-POT	1 VERY HOT
3 HOT	1 FIRES	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 33 (0.33%)

V. SAFETY, SECURITY

a. Safe and Secure

100 SAFETY	1 HOW SAFE IT IS GOING TO BE	1 SAFE UNDERGROUND
37 SAFE	1 HOW WE CAN BE SURE ITS SAFE	1 SAFE WAY OF DISPOSAL
17 SECURITY	1 I HOPE IT'S SAFE	1 SAFE?
5 PROTECTION	1 I WOULD WONDER ABOUT THE SAFETY	1 SAFER THAN ABOVE GROUND
3 SAFEGUARDED	1 I'D LIKE IT TO BE SAFE	1 SAFETY FACTORS
2 GEOLOGICALLY SAFE	1 MAKE IT SAFE	1 SAFETY IN TESTING
2 HIGH SECURITY	1 MAKE SURE SAFE	1 SAFETY IS IMPORTANT
2 IS IT SAFE	1 MODERATE SAFETY	1 SAFETY OF GROUND WATER
2 SAFER	1 MORE PRECAUTIONS	1 SAFETY OF IT
2 SECURE	1 MUST BE SAFE	1 SAFETY PRECAUTION
1 AS LONG AS IT'S SAFE WE WOULD BE SAFE	1 NEED TO BE SAFE	1 SAFETY PRECAUTIONS
1 AWAY FROM EARTHQUAKES	1 NEEDS TO BE SECURE	1 SAFETY PROBLEMS
1 BETTER BE SAFE	1 NOT DANGEROUS	1 SHOULD BE SAFER
1 CONCERN ABOUT SAFETY	1 NOT HARMFUL TO PEOPLE	1 SOMEWHAT SAFE
1 CONCERN FOR SAFETY	1 NOT SURE HOW SAFE THEY ARE	1 STORED AND SEALED
1 ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY	1 NOT THREATENING	1 STORED CORRECTLY
1 FAIRLY SAFE	1 NOT WORRIED, SAFE	1 SUFFICIENTLY SAFE
1 FINDING A SOLUTION TO MAKE SAFE	1 PRETTY SAFE	1 UNCASEMENT SECURITY
1 HIGHLY ENGINEERED, SECURE PLACE	1 SAFE FROM NATURAL DISASTER	1 UNHAZARDOUS
1 HIGHLY SECURE	1 SAFE STORAGE	1 VERY SAFE
1 HOW SAFE	1 SAFE STORAGE AREA	1 WHERE WILL IT BE SAFE?
1 HOW SAFE IT IS	1 SAFE TYPE OF PLACE	1 WHETHER OR NOT ITS SAFE

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 228 (2.28%)

b. Facilities Security

6 SECRET	1 BARBED WIRE	1 MEN IN FIREPROOF OUTFITS
4 SECRETIVE	1 BARRIERS	1 OFF LIMITS
3 FENCES	1 BUNCH OF PEOPLE IN PROTECTIVE SUITS	1 OFF LIMITS ZONE
3 GUARDED	1 CHAIN LINK FENCES	1 POTENTIAL SECURITY
2 GUARDS	1 CONCEALMENT	1 SECRET TUNNELS
2 PROTECTED	1 FENCED OFF	1 SECURITY GUARD
2 SECRETS	1 GUARD HOUSES	1 SECURITY STATIONS
2 TOP SECRET	1 GUARDS AND PATROL	1 VERY TIGHT SECURITY
1 A FENCED IN AREA	1 INCREASED SECURITY	
1 BADGES	1 KEPT SECRET	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 44 (0.44%)

c. Control, Containment and Cleanup

3 CONTROLLED	1 CONTROLS	1 MUST BE CONTAINED
2 CLEAN UP	1 ENCAPSULATED, BURIED, AND MONITORED	1 NEED TO BE MONITORED
2 CONTAIN	1 FIND A WAY TO CONTAIN IT	1 NEEDED TO MONITOR
2 CONTAINED	1 HAVE TO FIND A WAY TO CONTROL	1 NEEDS BETTER CONTROL
1 CLEAN IT UP	1 IT WOULD HAVE TO BE CONTAINED	1 NEEDS CONTROL
1 CLEAN-UP	1 MONITOR	1 NEEDS TO BE CLEANED UP/REMOVED
	1 MONITORING	1 SEALED FOREVER

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 32 (0.32%)

d. Caution

13 CAUTION	4 CAUTIOUS	1 DAMN CAREFUL
7 CAREFUL	1 BE CAREFUL	1 PRECAUTION

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 27 (0.27%)

VI. CONCERNS

a. Problems

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 26 PROBLEMS | 1 DIFFICULT QUESTION | 1 PICKETING |
| 22 TROUBLE | 1 DIFFICULT TO STORE | 1 POTENTIAL PROBLEM |
| 12 PROBLEM | 1 DIFFICULTY | 1 PROBLEM FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS |
| 6 CHAOS | 1 DIFFICULTY IN MONITORING | 1 PROBLEM TO STORE |
| 4 BIG PROBLEM | 1 DIFFICULTY OF DISPOSING | 1 PROBLEMATIC |
| 3 QUESTIONS | 1 DISPOSALS ARE HARD | 1 PROBLEMS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS |
| 2 SCANDAL | 1 ENGINEERING CHALLENGE | 1 PROBLEMS IN THE AREA |
| 2 TROUBLESOME | 1 ENVIRONMENT PROBLEMS | 1 QUESTION |
| 1 A LOT OF PROBLEMS | 1 HARD TO CONTROL | 1 SCIENTIFIC PROBLEM |
| 1 BIG CLEAN-UP PROBLEM | 1 HARD TO GET RID OF | 1 SERIOUS PROBLEM |
| 1 BIG TROUBLE | 1 HASSLE | 1 TERRIBLE PROBLEM |
| 1 BOTHERSOME | 1 HUGE PROBLEM | 1 THE PROBLEM OF WHERE |
| 1 CAUSE SOME HARDSHIP TO PUBLIC | 1 IT'S A MESS | 1 TROUBLES |
| 1 COMPLICATED | 1 IT'S A PROBLEM | 1 UPSET PEOPLE |
| 1 CONCERN ABOUT HAZARD | 1 LIMITED CAPACITY | 1 WHAT PROBLEMS WILL IT CAUSE |
| 1 CONCERN FOR ENVIRONMENT | 1 NO PLACE TO PUT IT | |
| 1 DEEP TROUBLE | | |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 119 (1.19%)

b. Questions

- | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| 4 WHY | 1 HOW MUCH | 1 WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO PUT IT |
| 3 IS IT NECESSARY | 1 HOW MUCH OF QUANTITY | 1 WHERE IS IT |
| 3 WHERE | 1 HOW WELL IT IF MAINTAINED | 1 WHERE IT IS |
| 1 DO WE NEED IT | 1 HOW WOULD YOU GET IT AWAY FROM PEOPLE | 1 WHERE IT'S GOING TO BE |
| 1 ENVIRONMENTAL QUESTIONS | 1 I HAVE A LOT OF QUESTIONS | 1 WHERE PUT IT |
| 1 HOW BIG | 1 IS IT DANGEROUS | 1 WHERE STORED? |
| 1 HOW CAN YOU GET RID OF NUCLEAR WASTE? | 1 IS THERE SOME WAY TO GET RID OF IT | 1 WHERE THE CLOSEST ONE IS TO ME? |
| 1 HOW DEEP TO BURY IT | 1 WHAT DAMAGE COULD IT DO | 1 WHERE TO BURY IT |
| 1 HOW EFFECT LAND | 1 WHAT DO YOU DO WITH IT | 1 WHERE TO PUT IT |
| 1 HOW IT AFFECTS US | 1 WHAT FOR | 1 WHERE TO PUT THEM |
| 1 HOW IT IS AFFECTING PLANET | 1 WHAT HAPPENS | 1 WHERE WILL IT BE LOCATED |
| 1 HOW IT WILL AFFECT PEOPLE | 1 WHAT IS IT | 1 WHETHER PRIVATE OWNED OR GOVERNMENT |
| 1 HOW IT WOULD AFFECT THE COMMUNITY | 1 WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF IT | 1 WHO WANTS IT |
| 1 HOW IT WOULD AFFECT THE ENVIRONMENT | 1 WHAT IT MIGHT DO TO THE SOIL | 1 WHY DO WE HAVE TO HAVE IT |
| 1 HOW LONG HAS IT BEEN THERE | 1 WHAT TO DO WITH IT | 1 WONDER WHERE LOCATED |
| 1 HOW LONG IT LASTS | 1 WHAT WOULD HAPPEN? | 1 WONDERING WHERE IT WAS |
| 1 HOW LONG UNTIL IT GETS TO GROUND LEVEL | 1 WHERE ARE THEY PUTTING IT? | |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 58 (0.58%)

c. Health

- | | | |
|-----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 22 HEALTH | 1 HEALTH COVERAGE | 1 HEALTH OF PEOPLE IN AREA |
| | | 1 HEALTH QUESTION |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 25 (0.25%)

d. Unsolvable

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| 4 FUTILE | 1 FUTILITY | 1 NEVER GOES AWAY |
| 2 IMPOSSIBLE | 1 IMPOSSIBLE DREAM | 1 NO SOLUTION |
| 1 BOTHERS ME WHETHER WE CAN GET RID OF IT | 1 INDISPOSABLE | 1 NO WAY TO CONTROL IT |
| 1 CAN'T BE SAFELY DONE | 1 NEVER GET RID OF IT | 1 NO WAY TO GET RID OF IT |
| 1 CAN'T TAKE CARE OF WASTE | 1 NEVER GETS BURIED | 1 NOT FEASIBLE |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 19 (0.19%)

e. Family

- | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| 7 CHILDREN | 1 CHILDREN AND GRANDCHILDREN | 1 KIDS |
| 2 MY CHILDREN | 1 FAMILY | 1 SAFETY, FAMILY |
| 1 AFFECTING CHILDREN | 1 GRANDCHILDREN | 1 WORRY ABOUT KIDS MORE THAN OLD PEOPLE |
| 1 BABIES | 1 HURTING MY CHILDREN & GRANDCHILDREN | |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 18 (0.18%)

VI. CONCERNS

f. Uncontrolled

5 UNCONTROLLED
2 NO CONTROL
1 CONTROLS, LACK OF

1 LACK OF CONTROL
1 MAY NOT BE CONTAINED
1 NO GUARANTEE OF CONTAINMENTS

1 NOT CONTROLLED
1 UNCONTAINED
1 UNCONTAINED

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 14 (0.14%)

g. Controversy

3 CONTROVERSIAL
3 CONTROVERSY
2 CONFLICT

1 A LOT OF CONTROVERSY
1 ALWAYS ARGUE
1 FIGHT IN COURT

1 SQUABBLING
1 STICKY ISSUE

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 13 (0.13%)

h. Unpredictable

5 UNSTABLE
2 UNPREDICTABLE

1 NEVER KNOW WHAT COULD HAPPEN
1 UNEXPECTED

1 UNEXPECTEDNESS
1 UNFORESEEN

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 11 (0.11%)

i. Mistakes

2 MISTAKE
1 A FUCK UP
1 BIG MISTAKES

1 CARELESS
1 CARELESSNESS
1 FOLLY OF OLD MEN

1 MISTAKES, MISHAPS

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 8 (0.08%)

j. Serious

2 IMPORTANT
2 SERIOUS

1 EXTREMELY SERIOUS
1 LIFE AND DEATH

1 LIVES AT STAKE

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 7 (0.07%)

k. Skeptical

2 SKEPTICAL

1 I QUESTION THE NEED

1 SKEPTICAL ABOUT IT
1 SKEPTICISM

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 5 (0.05%)

l. Concerns - Other

2 QUESTIONING
1 CRACKS IN EARTH
1 CRITICAL TIME WISE
1 DEFECT
1 DEFECTIVE VALVES

1 DEFECTS
1 FAIR
1 FAIRNESS
1 GEOLOGICALLY UNFIT
1 NO WAY OF DESTROYING

1 TARGET FOR ENEMY ATTACK
1 TARGET FOR PROBLEMS
1 TARGET FOR TERRORISM

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 14 (0.14%)

VII. SOCIETAL INSTITUTIONS

a. Government / Industry

58 GOVERNMENT	1 DOW COMPANY	1 GOVERNMENT, U.S.
8 POLITICAL	1 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY	1 GOVERNMENTS
5 GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT	1 ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS	1 INDUSTRY
4 BUREAUCRACY	1 FEDERAL	1 LARGE CORPORATIONS NOT DOING
3 REGULATIONS	1 FEDERAL RESERVE	1 LAWS
2 BIG BUSINESS	1 FEDS	1 NEGATIVE GOVERNMENT
2 BIG INDUSTRY	1 FUCKED UP GOVERNMENT	1 PEOPLE WILL PAY FOR GOVERNMENT MISTAKES
2 BUSINESS	1 GOVERNMENT CONTROL	1 PRESIDENT
2 FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	1 GOVERNMENT CONTROLLED	1 PRESIDENT BUSH
2 INDUSTRIAL	1 GOVERNMENT DOLLARS IN RESEARCH	1 RULES AND REGULATIONS
1 A LOT OF SAFETY REGULATIONS	1 GOVERNMENT FORCE	1 SENATORS
1 CITY HALL	1 GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE	1 THE GOVERNMENT
1 CONGRESS	1 GOVERNMENT IS RESPONSIBLE	1 THE GOVERNMENT IS CORRUPT
1 DEALING WITH THE GOVERNMENT	1 GOVERNMENT MADE IT/SHOULD CARE FOR IT	1 THE STUPIDITY OF THE GOVERNMENT
1 DEFENSE DEPARTMENT	1 GOVERNMENT SPENDING	1 UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IS FUCKED
1 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE	1 GOVERNMENT, BAD	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 125 (1.25%)

b. Military / Weapons

23 BOMBS	1 ARMY DEPOTS	1 NUCLEAR TESTING
17 MILITARY	1 ATOM BOMB	1 NUCLEAR TESTS
9 FALLOUT	1 ATOMIC TESTING	1 NUCLEAR WARHEADS
5 TEST SITE	1 BOMBING, UNDERGROUND	1 NUCLEAR WEAPONS
7 BOMB	1 HOPE NOT NEEDED FOR WARFARE	1 NUKE BOMBS
4 MISSILES	1 HYDROGEN BOMB TESTING	1 PENTAGONS
3 ARMY	1 LEAD TO WAR HAZARDS	1 PREPARATION OF WAR
3 GUNS	1 MILITARY BASE	1 ROCKETS
2 ATOMIC BOMB	1 MILITARY DEFENSE	1 TESTING IN NEVADA
2 BOMBING	1 MISSILE SITES	1 WAR GAMES
2 DEFENSE	1 MX MISSILE	1 WARHEADS
2 WEAPON	1 NATIONAL DEFENSE	1 WORLD WAR II
2 WEAPONS	1 NUCLEAR BOMBS	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 106 (1.06%)

c. Science, Technology, Research and Progress

6 TECHNOLOGY	1 EXPERIMENTATION	1 SCIENTIFICALLY VALID
6 TESTING	1 HIGH TECHNOLOGY	1 SCIENTIST
4 SCIENCE	1 LET SCIENTISTS HANDLE IT, NOT MEDIA	1 SCIENTISTS SHOULD CHECK OUT SAFETY
3 PROGRESS	1 LET THE EXPERTS DECIDE	1 SOMETHING THAT NEEDS TO BE RESEARCHED
2 RESEARCH	1 OBSOLETE TECHNOLOGY	1 TECHNOLOGY, TO STOP RADIATION
1 ADEQUATE TECHNOLOGY	1 PHYSICS	1 TESTING IS NECESSARY
1 ADVANCEMENT	1 RESEARCHED	1 THERE SHOULD BE MORE RESEARCH
1 COLD FUSION	1 SCIENTIFIC	1 VERY TECHNICAL
1 EXPERIMENTAL STAGES	1 SCIENTIFIC STUDY	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 42 (0.42%)

d. Political Process

19 POLITICS	1 POLITICAL BATTLE	1 POLITICAL STRIFE
2 POLITICIANS	1 POLITICAL LIES	1 STRONGER CONTROL POLITICALLY
1 BIGGER PROBLEM WITH WASHINGTON	1 POLITICAL MANEUVERING	1 TOO POLITICIZED
1 MONEY-POLITICAL	1 POLITICAL PLOY	1 VERY POLITICAL

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 31 (0.31%)

VIII. ECOLOGY

a. Natural Environment

44 WATER	1 BEACHES	1 PLANTS
35 ENVIRONMENT	1 BIRDS	1 RING-TAIL POSSUMS
6 GROUND WATER	1 EARTH	1 RIVER
5 AIR	1 ECOLOGY	1 THE WATER
3 MOUNTAINS	1 ECOLOGY, U.S.	1 UNDERGROUND LAKE
3 WATER, GROUND	1 ENVIRONMENTAL	1 UNDERGROUND WATER
2 OCEAN	1 FISH	1 VEGETATION
2 SOIL	1 FLOWERS	1 VEGETATION ON EARTH
1 AIR QUALITY	1 HABITAT	1 WATER, UNDERGROUND
1 ANIMAL LIFE	1 LAKES	1 WILDERNESS
1 AQUIFER	1 NATURE	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 124 (1.24%)

b. Food and Water Supply

3 WATER SUPPLY	1 AGRICULTURAL DISASTER	1 WATER WELL
2 AGRICULTURE	1 BAD FOR CROPS	1 WATER, STABILITY
2 DRINKING WATER	1 FAILING CROPS	1 WATERTABLE
2 FOOD	1 HOW IT WILL AFFECT WATER USED	1 WELL WATER DESTROYED
2 WATER SYSTEMS	1 NO VEGETABLES	1 WELLS
2 WATER TABLE	1 WATER RUN OFF	1 WOULDNT WANT TO DRINK THE WATER

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 25 (0.25%)

c. Climate

2 COLD	2 DRY	1 HOT WEATHER
2 COOL	1 CLIMATE	1 WET

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 9 (0.09%)

IX. NECESSARY

a. Necessary

56 NECESSARY	1 I THINK IT'S CERTAINLY NECESSARY	1 SOMETHING THAT HAS TO HAPPEN
21 NECESSITY	1 IT IS A NECESSITY	1 SOMETHING WE HAVE TO HAVE
17 NEEDED	1 IT IS NECESSARY	1 SOMETHING YOU HAVE TO LIVE WITH
9 NECESSARY EVIL	1 IT MUST BE DONE	1 SOMEWHAT NECESSARY
3 HAS TO BE DONE	1 IT'S A MUST	1 THEY GOT TO DO SOMETHING WITH IT
3 WE NEED THEM	1 IT'S A SHAME THAT WE HAVE TO HAVE IT	1 THEY'RE NECESSARY
2 IT'S GOT TO GO SOMEWHERE	1 KNOW IT IS NECESSARY	1 UNDERSTAND THE NEED FOR IT
2 IT'S NECESSARY	1 MANDATORY	1 UNPLEASANT NECESSITY
2 IT'S NEEDED	1 MUST BE SOMEWHERE	1 WE HAVE TO HAVE THEM
1 BUT HAVE TO HAVE THEM	1 NEED	1 WE NEED IT
1 ESSENTIAL	1 NEED IT	1 WE NEED IT AND NOBODY WANTS IT
1 GOT TO DO SOMETHING WITH IT	1 NEED MORE	1 WE NEED MORE PLACES FOR THAT
1 GOT TO PUT IT SOMEWHERE	1 NEEDED IN THAT AREA	1 WE NEED ONE PLACE FOR ALL OF IT
1 GOT TO PUT SOMEWHERE	1 NO CHOICE	1 WE NEED SOME PLACE TO GET RID OF IT
1 HAS TO HAPPEN	1 NO OTHER CHOICE	1 WE SHOULD HAVE SOME
1 HAVE TO HAVE IT	1 NOT GOOD, BUT NEEDED	1 YOU'VE GOT TO HAVE THEM
1 HAVE TO HAVE THEM	1 SOMETHING HAS TO BE DONE	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 156 (1.56%)

X. ECONOMICS

a. Cost

23 EXPENSIVE	1 COST TO MUCH	1 INSTANT DEBT
6 COSTLY	1 COST TO TAXPAYERS	1 PROPERTY VALUES
4 COST	1 DIRTY PROPERTY VALUE	1 PROPERTY VALUES TO DROP
4 TAXES	1 DOLLARS WASTED	1 THE PRICE WE PAY
3 EXPENSE	1 ECONOMIC	1 WHAT'S THE COST
2 ECONOMICS	1 EXPENSES FROM NUCLEAR WASTE	1 WHO'S GOING TO PAY FOR IT
1 BIG FUNDS	1 HIGH COST	
1 COST MONEY	1 HOW MUCH IT'S GOING TO COST	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 58 (0.58%)

b. Employment

33 JOBS	1 BUSY PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT	1 INCREASED JOBS
11 EMPLOYMENT	1 CREATED EMPLOYMENT	1 MORE JOBS
8 WORK	1 HIGH PAY	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 57 (0.57%)

c. Money / Income

16 MONEY	1 INCOME FOR PEOPLE IN THE STATE	1 MONEY FOR STATE
2 INCOME	1 LOT OF MONEY	1 PROFITABLE
2 LOTS OF MONEY	1 LUCRATIVE	1 STATE INCOME
1 DOLLARS	1 MONETARY	1 WHAT'S THE PROFIT OF THE CO.

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 29 (0.29%)

d. Economics - Other

ECONOMY	1 UNEMPLOYMENT
---------	----------------

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 5 (0.05%)

XI. INFORMATION, KNOWLEDGE

a. Uninformed

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 4 DON'T KNOW | 1 DON'T KNOW WHAT TO DO WITH IT | 1 LACK OF WASTE DISPOSAL KNOWLEDGE |
| 4 IGNORANCE | 1 DON'T KNOW WHERE THEY ARE | 1 MISUNDERSTANDING |
| 4 UNFAMILIAR | 1 DON'T THINK PUBLIC IS INFORMED | 1 NAIVE |
| 3 UNCERTAIN | 1 DON'T UNDERSTAND | 1 NO COMPREHENSION |
| 2 CONFUSING | 1 DON'T UNDERSTAND IT | 1 NO IDEA |
| 2 CONFUSION | 1 I DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY DO WITH THEM | 1 NOT INFORMED ABOUT IT |
| 2 DON'T KNOW ABOUT IT | 1 I DON'T KNOW | 1 NOT SURE WHAT IT IS |
| 2 DON'T KNOW WHAT IT IS | 1 I KNOW NOTHING ABOUT THEM | 1 PEOPLE DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT IT |
| 2 UNEDUCATED | 1 I REALLY DON'T KNOW | 1 PUBLIC MISUNDERSTANDING |
| 1 DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT IT TO MESS WITH | 1 IGNORANCE-NOT KNOWING ABOUT IT | 1 SO MUCH WE DON'T KNOW |
| 1 DON'T KNOW HOW BIG | 1 IGNORANT PUBLIC OPINION | 1 SO MUCH WE DON'T UNDERSTAND |
| 1 DON'T KNOW HOW TO DISPOSE OF IT SAFELY | 1 LACK OF INFORMATION | 1 UNINFORMED |
| 1 DON'T KNOW SOLUTION | 1 LACK OF KNOWLEDGE | 1 UNKNOWLEDGEABLE |
| 1 DON'T KNOW WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT | 1 LACK OF UNDERSTANDING | |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 57 (0.57%)

b. Unsure / Unknown

- | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|----------------------|
| 20 UNKNOWN | 2 DOUBT | UNKNOWN-GOOD OR BAD? |
| 11 UNCERTAINTY | 1 UNKNOWN FACTORS OF EFFECTS | |
| 3 UNSURE | 1 UNKNOWN QUALITIES | |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 39 (0.39%)

c. Curiosity, Interest and Knowledge

- | | | |
|---------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3 CURIOSITY | 1 INFORMATION | 1 PEOPLE SHOULD BE MORE AWARE OF IT |
| 2 CURIOUS | 1 INFORMATIVE | 1 PROPER EDUCATION |
| 2 EDUCATION | 1 INFORMED | 1 PUBLIC AWARENESS |
| 2 INTERESTING | 1 MORE INFORMATION | 1 PUBLIC INTEREST |
| 2 KNOWLEDGE | 1 MORE UNDERSTANDING | 1 PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE |
| 1 AWARENESS | 1 NEED TO BE EDUCATED ON IT | 1 UNDERSTAND |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 24 (0.24%)

d. Media

- | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|
| 2 MEDIA | 1 NEWSPAPER | 1 TELEVISION |
| 2 PUBLICITY | 1 RADIO | |
| 1 MEDIA CONTROL | 1 SENSATION PRESS | |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 9 (0.09%)

e. Information, Knowledge - Other

- | | |
|-------------|------------|
| 1 UNSTUDIED | 1 UNTESTED |
|-------------|------------|

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 2 (0.02%)

XII. POSITIVE

a. Positive, Unconcerned

- | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 4 GOOD | 1 GOOD PLACE TO KEEP IT | 1 NOTHING AGAINST |
| 2 BENEFITS | 1 GOOD PLACE TO STORE | 1 O.K. |
| 2 GOOD IDEA | 1 HAPPY DAYS | 1 OKAY WITH ME |
| 2 NOT WORRIED ABOUT IT | 1 HAPPY THOUGHT | 1 ON THE POSITIVE SIDE |
| 2 SOUNDS GOOD | 1 IT DOESN'T BUG ME | 1 POSITIVE FEELINGS |
| 1 ACCEPT IT | 1 IT'S ALL RIGHT WITH ME | 1 POSSIBLY GOOD IDEA |
| 1 AFFIRMATIVE | 1 LOW RISK | 1 PRETTY GOOD |
| 1 ALL RIGHT | 1 NO PROBLEM | 1 PRO |
| 1 ALRIGHT | 1 NO PROBLEM WITH IT | 1 PUT IT IN |
| 1 BENEFICIAL | 1 NO SWEAT | 1 SHOULD HAVE IT |
| 1 BEST THING | 1 NO WORRY ABOUT IT | 1 SMART |
| 1 DESIRABLE | 1 NONTHREATENING | 1 THAT'S FINE |
| 1 DOESN'T BOTHER ME | 1 NOT A BIG DEAL | 1 UNAFRAID |
| 1 DOESN'T BOTHER ME A BIT | 1 NOT AFRAID OF IT | 1 UNCONCERNED |
| 1 DOESN'T WORRY ME | 1 NOT AS WORRIED AS OTHERS | 1 WELCOME |
| 1 FAVOR | 1 NOT CONCERNED | 1 WOULDN'T BOTHER ME |
| 1 FAVORABLE | 1 NOT TOO WORRIED ABOUT IT | |
| 1 GOOD FOR COUNTRY | 1 NOT WORRIED | |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 59 (0.59%)

b. Effective

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| 2 EFFICIENCY | 1 BETTER UNDERGROUND THAN ABOVE | 1 LOGICAL |
| 2 WELL DESIGNED | 1 ECONOMICAL | 1 MAYBE UNDERGROUND WOULD BE BEST |
| 2 WELL MAINTAINED | 1 EFFICIENT | 1 ONE OF THE BEST WAYS TO DISPOSE OF IT |
| 1 APPROPRIATE | 1 FINE UNDERGROUND | 1 ONE OF THE FEW SOLUTIONS WE'VE GOT |
| 1 BEST ALTERNATIVE | 1 GOOD IDEA-IT CAN'T BE PUT ON TOP | 1 PROPERLY DESIGNED |
| 1 BETTER THAN ABOVE GROUND | 1 GOOD SENSE | 1 WELL SITED |
| 1 BETTER THAN OTHER SOLUTION | 1 GOOD TO BE UNDERGROUND | |
| 1 BETTER THAN SENDING IT INTO SPACE | 1 HELPFUL | |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 25 (0.25%)

c. Improved Environment

- | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 2 CLEAN | 1 CLEAN ENVIRONMENT | 1 NO FALLOUT |
| 1 ADD TO ENVIRONMENT | 1 LESS POLLUTION | 1 NO MORE POLLUTION |
| 1 CLEAN AIR | 1 LOW SMOG | |

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 9 (.09%)

d. Feasible

- | | |
|------------|------------|
| 2 FEASIBLE | 1 SOLVABLE |
|------------|------------|

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 3 (0.03%)

e. Positive - Other

- | |
|---------------------|
| 1 USE NUCLEAR POWER |
|---------------------|

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 1 (0.01%)

XIII. MISCELLANEOUS

a. Future / Long Lasting

14 FUTURE	1 FUTURE CLEANUP	1 LONG-TERM PROBLEM
8 FUTURE GENERATIONS	1 FUTURE DANGER	1 LONGEVITY
4 GENERATIONS	1 FUTURE NOT TOO BRIGHT	1 MAY ENDANGER FUTURE GENERATIONS
4 LONG HALF LIFE	1 FUTURE PROBLEMS WHEN IT'S STILL THERE	1 MORTGAGING OUR CHILDREN FUTURE
4 PERMANENT	1 GENERATION	1 NO REVERSAL
3 FOREVER	1 GENERATIONS OF DAMAGE	1 PERMANENCE
3 LONG TERM	1 HALF LIFE FOREVER	1 PERMANENT DAMAGE
2 10,000 YEARS	1 HOW LONG WILL IT LAST	1 PROTECTION FOR FUTURE
2 LONG LASTING	1 HOW LONG WILL THEY BE TRANSPORTING IT	1 STAYS IN EARTH FOREVER
2 LONG TERM EFFECTS	1 LASTING EFFECTS	1 STORAGE FOR MILLIONS OF YEARS
1 25,000 YEARS	1 LASTS FOREVER	1 STORAGE, LONG TERM
1 ALWAYS THERE	1 LASTS MANY YEARS	1 THE FUTURE OF THE WORLD
1 AWFUL LONG HALF LIFE	1 LONG DISSOLVING TIME	1 THE NEXT GENERATION
1 CHANCE OF FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS	1 LONG LASTING PROBLEMS	1 UNCERTAIN FUTURE
1 DETRIMENTAL IN YEARS TO COME	1 LONG RANGE EFFECTS	1 YEARS DOWN ROAD
1 DON'T BIODEGRADE	1 LONG TERM TROUBLE	
1 EVERLASTING		

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 85 (0.85%)

b. Energy / Power

13 POWER	2 NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS	1 NUCLEAR POWER STATION
12 ENERGY	2 POWER PLANT	1 POTENTIAL ENERGY SOURCE
8 ELECTRICITY	1 CHEAP ELECTRICITY	1 POWER STATION
6 NUCLEAR POWER	1 ENERGY SAVING	1 POWER, ENERGY
5 POWER PLANTS	1 ENERGY SAVINGS	1 UNLIMITED POWER
4 NUCLEAR PLANT	1 NUCLEAR ENERGY	1 USEFUL FOR ENERGY UTILIZATION
2 NUCLEAR POWER PLANT	1 NUCLEAR PLANTS	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 65 (0.65%)

c. Transportation

20 TRANSPORTATION	1 HAULING	1 TRANSPORTATION OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
2 CARS	1 RAILROAD OR TRUCK	1 TRANSPORTATION, CHEMICALS
2 RAILROAD	1 SHIPMENT	1 TRANSPORTATION, RAILROAD
2 TRANSPORTATION, ACCIDENTS	1 SHIPMENTS	1 TRANSPORTATION, WASTE
2 TRUCKS	1 TRAFFIC CONGESTION	1 TRUCK

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 38 (0.38%)

d. Find Alternatives

5 ALTERNATIVES	1 FLOATING NUCLEAR WASTE	1 NOT IN FAVOR OF BURYING
1 ALTERNATIVE METHODS	1 GOT TO BE A BETTER WAY	1 OTHER SOURCES FOR DISPOSAL
1 ALTERNATIVES	1 GOV NEEDS TO THINK OF SOMETHING DIFFRNT	1 SHOULD BE CHANGED
1 BETTER SOLUTION	1 HAVE BETTER WAY TO GET RID OF IT	1 SOMETHING BETTER
1 BETTER WAY OF STORAGE	1 I DON'T THINK THEY SHOULD BURY THE STUFF	1 SOMETHING BETTER MANAGED
1 COME UP WITH ALTERNATIVE	1 MUST BE A BETTER WAY	1 THERE'S A BETTER IDEA
1 FIGURE OUT A WAY TO NEUTRALIZE IT	1 NEED AN ALTERNATE SOLUTION	1 THINK OF A BETTER WAY
1 FIND ANOTHER ALTERNATIVE	1 NEED BETTER WAY TO GET RID OF IT	1 WISH SOMETHING OTHER THAN THAT
1 FIND ANOTHER WAY	1 NEED TO FIND A BETTER WAY TO DISPOSE	1 WISH THERE WAS A BETTER WAY

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 31 (0.31%)

e. Natural Disasters (Potential or Actual)

19 EARTHQUAKE	2 VOLCANO	1 FLOODS
6 EARTHQUAKES	1 EARTHQUAKES, FAULTS	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 29 (0.29%)

XIII. MISCELLANEOUS**f. Population**

9 POPULATION	1 CROWDED	1 LARGE CITIES
5 PEOPLE	1 CROWDS	1 POPULATION INCREASE
3 LIVES	1 HUMANITY	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 22 (0.22%)

g. Degree of Distance

11 DISTANCE	1 CLOSE	1 FIFTY-MILES AWAY
2 FAR	1 CLOSE TO WHERE I LIVE	1 PROXIMITY
1 100 MILES AWAY	1 DISTANCE AWAY FROM THINGS	
1 20-MILES	1 DISTANCE FROM	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 21 (0.21%)

h. Neutral / Apathetic / Mixed Feelings

2 DOESN'T MATTER	1 DON'T CARE	1 INDIFFERENCE
2 NEUTRAL	1 DON'T OPPOSE IT	1 INDIFFERENT
1 APATHETIC WITH THAT SUBJECT	1 DON'T THINK ABOUT IT	1 IT WON'T MATTER
1 BOREDOM	1 FEW PEOPLE WHO CARE	1 MIXED FEELINGS
1 BORING	1 INDECISIVE	1 NEUTRALITY
1 DOESN'T EFFECT ME		1 NOTHING, DOESN'T AFFECT ME

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 20 (0.20%)

i. Supervision / Responsibility

2 MANAGEMENT	1 MANAGEMENT	1 OBLIGATION TO DEAL WITH IT RESPONSIBLY
2 RESPONSIBILITY	1 MORE RESPONSIBLE	1 SOMEBODY WATCH OVER IT
2 SUPERVISION	1 NEED SUPERVISION	1 SUPERVISED
1 MANAGED PROPERLY	1 NEEDS TO BE HANDLED RIGHT	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 14 (0.14%)

j. Public Figures

3 RONALD REAGAN	1 GEORGE BUSH	1 NIXON
2 JERRY FALWELL	1 GORBECHEV	1 OLLIE NORTH
1 DR. TELLER	1 MERYL STREEP	1 REAGAN

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 12 (0.12%)

k. Fiction

1 1950S PICTURE	1 MOVIES	1 SCIENCE FICTION MOVIE
1 A MOVIE I SAW ONCE	1 REMINDS ME OF A MOVIE	1 SCIENCE FICTION NOVEL
1 DAY AFTER-MOVIE	1 REPO MAN	1 THE DAY AFTER
1 MOVIE	1 SCIENCE FICTION	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 11 (0.11%)

l. Problem Avoidance

2 DON'T WANT TO THINK ABOUT IT	1 I WISH IT WASN'T NECESSARY	1 WISH WE DIDN'T HAVE THEM
1 DON'T LIKE TO THINK ABOUT IT	1 I WISH WE COULD FORGET ABOUT WASTE	1 WISH WE DIDN'T NEED THEM
1 I TRY NOT TO	1 TRY NOT TO THINK ABOUT IT	

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 9 (0.09%)

XIII. MISCELLANEOUS

m. Inevitability

4 INEVITABLE
1 GOING TO DO

1 GONNA BE GONNA BE
1 IT'S GOING TO HAPPEN

1 WERE GOING TO HAVE

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 8 (0.08%)

n. Faith

1 ETERNAL
1 ETERNAL LIFE

1 FAITH
1 HEAVEN

1 LORD TAKES CARE OF EVERYTHING

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 5 (0.05%)

o. O.K. If...

1 AS LONG AS IT IS HANDLED RIGHT

1 AS LONG AS IT'S NOT DANGEROUS

1 GOOD IF UNDERGROUND
1 OK IF AWAY FROM POPULATION

TOTAL Frequency for Category: 4 (0.04%)

XIV. UNCATEGORIZED IMAGES

5 NOTHING
 4 EXPOSURE
 4 LIFE
 4 TIME
 3 BREATHING
 3 RECYCLE
 2 CLAUSTROPHOBIA
 2 COMMUNISM
 2 CONSERVATION
 2 CRIES
 2 DUST
 2 EFFECTS
 2 GREEN
 2 GREENPEACE
 2 GROWTH
 2 HELP
 2 HIDE
 2 HOSPITAL
 2 LIGHTS
 2 NO GROWTH
 2 PEACE
 2 PLANT
 2 PROTECTIVE
 2 RECYCLEABLE
 2 RED
 2 RUSSIANS
 2 SCAPE GOAT
 2 SHELTER
 2 SIGNS
 2 SPACE
 2 SURVIVAL
 2 TOO MANY
 2 TREATMENT
 2 UNREAL
 2 WOULDN'T WANT TO BE AROUND
 1 12TH GRADE
 1 17TH/WASHINGTON
 1 1950'S
 1 A BUNCH OF STUFF UNDERGROUND
 1 A COP OUT
 1 A LOT OF TALK ABOUT IT
 1 A LOT OF TRAFFIC IN AND OUT
 1 A LOT OF WORK
 1 ABANDON
 1 ABANDONED
 1 ABANDONED MACHINERY
 1 ACCESSIBILITY
 1 ACCESSIBLE
 1 ACTION
 1 ADDRESS THE PROBLEM
 1 AFFECTING LIVES
 1 AFTERGLOW
 1 AFTERMATH
 1 AIR RAID
 1 ALIENATOR
 1 ALL ALONE
 1 ALTERNATIVE FORMS OF ENERGY
 1 ALTERNATIVE TO PROVIDE THAT POWER
 1 AMOUNT
 1 ANY REPOSITORY
 1 APS SHOULD PAY FOR IT
 1 ATTACKS
 1 AVAILABLE
 1 BACKFIRE
 1 BALD
 1 BALDNESS
 1 BARRELS, DEBRIS
 1 BARROWS
 1 BASE
 1 BASEMENT
 1 BATS
 1 BEER
 1 BEST FRIEND'S PARTY
 1 BI- PRODUCT
 1 BI-PRODUCTS
 1 BIGGER PROBLEM WITH LANGUAGE PEOPLE
 USE
 1 BITHERS TOY
 1 BIZARRE
 1 BLASTING
 1 BLIND
 1 BLOWING IT UP
 1 BLOWING THINGS UP
 1 BLOWN OUT OF PROPORTION
 1 BODY PARTS
 1 BRAVE
 1 BUDDIE PERCHETTI
 1 BUFFALO
 1 CAMWAYS MANAGEMENT
 1 CAN'T HELP ANYTHING
 1 CANYON
 1 CAPACITY
 1 CARE FOR WORKERS OF FACILITIES
 1 CAULDRON
 1 CHILDISH
 1 CHILDREN (GENERATION)
 1 CHINA LAKE-KIDS AFFECTED
 1 CITY DEPRESSION
 1 CLAUSTROPHOBIC
 1 CLEARING
 1 CLOSE TO AN OCEAN
 1 CLOSED FAST
 1 COAL MINE
 1 COMING
 1 CONSTRUCTION
 1 CONSUMER
 1 CONSUMER ADVICE
 1 CONTAGIOUS
 1 CONVERTED TO FUEL
 1 CORE
 1 COUNTRIES
 1 COVERAGE PROPERLY
 1 CPPP
 1 CURRENT
 1 CURTAILMENT
 1 DEFACING
 1 DEFINITE
 1 DEFOLIATION
 1 DENSE
 1 DEPENDS ON CIRCUMSTANCES
 1 DEPLETION
 1 DEPOSIT
 1 DESIGN OWN BETTER THEN ANYTHING ELSE
 1 DISARMAMENT
 1 DISPERSION
 1 DISPOSAL DEVICE
 1 DISPOSAL UNIT
 1 DO WITH WASTE
 1 DOG FOOD
 1 DON'T CAUSE PROBLEMS
 1 DON'T DESTROY COLORADO
 1 DON'T EDUCATE PEOPLE ABOUT IT
 1 DON'T THINK WE SHOULD WASTE ANY
 1 DON'T THROW WHERE THEY ARE
 1 DON'T WANT IN OPEN
 1 DONE RIGHT
 1 DOWNFALL OF POPULATION
 1 DRAINAGE
 1 DUDE
 1 EFFORT
 1 EMOTIONS
 1 EMPLOYEES
 1 ENGINEERING
 1 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
 1 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE
 1 ENVIRONMENTALIST
 1 ERUPTION
 1 ESCAPE
 1 EUROPE HAS LESS TROUBLE
 1 EVACUATION PLANS
 1 EVENTS
 1 EVENTUAL EVACUATION
 1 EVENTUALLY BECAME TOO COMMON
 1 EVERYBODY WOULD MOVE
 1 EVERYONE SHOULD BE INVOLVED
 1 EXECUTION
 1 EXISTING
 1 FACT OF LIFE
 1 FAD
 1 FARM ANIMALS
 1 FATIGUE
 1 FELL FOR PEOPLE LIVING CLOSE TO IT
 1 FENCING
 1 FEUDAL
 1 FIELD
 1 FIELD CONTAINERS
 1 FIELD IN GLASS
 1 FINDING THE LOCATIONS
 1 FRACTURE POINTS
 1 FUEL
 1 GAMBLE
 1 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
 1 GERMANY-UNDERGROUND SYSTEMS
 1 GETS BANNED
 1 GETTING RID OF THE WASTE
 1 GIANT GRANT
 1 GOING TO GET FULL
 1 GOLD SUITS
 1 GOSH
 1 GRAVEYARD
 1 GRAY
 1 GROUNDWORK
 1 GROWING NEAR THEM DEAD THINGS
 1 GUIDELINES
 1 GUSTY
 1 GUTTER
 1 GUTTERS
 1 HAIR
 1 HARD TO DEFINE
 1 HARD TO NOTICE IT'S THERE
 1 HARRY REID
 1 HECTIC
 1 HEIGHTS
 1 HIDING
 1 HIGH VOLTAGE
 1 HISTORY
 1 HOMELESS PEOPLE
 1 HOPING THAT WE CAN GET RID OF IT
 1 HOSPITALS
 1 HOT SPOTS
 1 HUGE GRAVEYARD
 1 HUGE WELLS
 1 HYPERTENSION
 1 I HOPE IT DOESN'T BLOW UP
 1 I HOPE IT IS IN A MOUNTAINOUS AREA
 1 I HOPE IT'S PUT TOGETHER WELL
 1 I WONDER WHY WE HAVE IT
 1 I'D VOTE TO HAVE IT CLEANED UP
 1 IMMEDIATE ATTENTION
 1 IMPROPER INFO
 1 INHABITABLE
 1 INSECTS
 1 INSENSITIVE
 1 INSIGNIFICANT
 1 INSULATION
 1 INTEX
 1 INVESTIGATION
 1 ION
 1 IRON
 1 ISLAND
 1 IT'S A POSSIBILITY
 1 JAPANESE
 1 JUST DO IT
 1 KEEP DENSELY POPULATED
 1 KEEP OUT OF SIGHT
 1 KENNELMAN CITY
 1 LACK
 1 LAND ELIMINATION
 1 LARGE COMP
 1 LAVA
 1 LAWSUITS, BIG ONES
 1 LAX CONTROL
 1 LEAVE
 1 LENGTH

1 LESS GROUND
 1 LESS PEOPLE
 1 LIABILITY
 1 LIBERAL
 1 LIBERALS
 1 LIMITED USE
 1 LIVE WITH IT
 1 LOCATED IN A MILDLY POPULATED AREA
 1 LONELY
 1 LONG TERM COMMITMENTS
 1 LONG WAIT
 1 LOOKS LIKE MY NEIGHBORHOOD
 1 LOSS OF SPACE
 1 LOTS OF SPACE FOR SOMETHING
 1 LOTS OF TIME
 1 LOUD
 1 LOW LEVEL IS NOT A CONCERN
 1 MAINTENANCE
 1 MAKING IT INTO TOURIST PLACE
 1 MALFUNCTIONING POSSIBILITIES
 1 MANMADE
 1 MASKS
 1 MATERIAL
 1 MELTING
 1 MELTING POT
 1 MIKE BOSMAN
 1 MILL
 1 MINING AREA
 1 MIXED
 1 MODERN
 1 MODERN TIME
 1 MOLDY
 1 MOSS
 1 MOVE THEM
 1 MOVEMENT
 1 MY HOUSE
 1 MYSTERY
 1 NATION
 1 NATIONAL
 1 NATURE WILL HOPEFULLY TAKE CARE OF IT
 1 NEGATE
 1 NEW
 1 NEW WORLD
 1 NEWS
 1 NIGHT
 1 NO EFFECT
 1 NO HOPE FOR SOLAR
 1 NO MATTER HOW THEY USE IT
 1 NO MORE ROOM INSIDE
 1 NO TRESPASSING SIGNS
 1 NO USE
 1 NO WORK
 1 NON-PEACE
 1 NON-PRODUCTIVE
 1 NONE
 1 NOSE
 1 NOT CLOSE TO WATER
 1 NOT ENOUGH
 1 NOT ENOUGH SAFE PLACES
 1 NOT EXPERIENCED
 1 NOT MUCH OF ANYTHING
 1 NOT NATURAL
 1 NOT SUFFICIENT
 1 NOT TAKEN CARE OF
 1 NOT THE WAY OF THE FUTURE
 1 NOT TOO DANGEROUS
 1 NOT WANT IT TO DAMAGE ANYTHING CLOSE BY
 1 NOT WELL REGULATED
 1 NOT WORTH TAKING CHANCES ON THE PEOPLE
 1 NOTHING COMES TO MIND
 1 NOWHERE
 1 OIL SPILL
 1 ON ALERT
 1 OPEC
 1 OPTIONAL
 1 ORGANIZED
 1 OUT OF IT
 1 OUT OF SIGHT
 1 OUT OF SIGHT, OUT OF MIND
 1 OUT OF WAY
 1 OVER-RATED
 1 OVERALL USES HELPFUL
 1 OWN
 1 PATRIOTISM
 1 PEACE
 1 PEACE WILL OVERCOME
 1 PEOPLE DON'T KNOW IT'S THERE
 1 PEOPLE RELATIONS
 1 PEOPLE WON'T TRY SOMETHING DIFFERENT
 1 PERMEATES
 1 PLACE
 1 PLANNING
 1 PLANTATION DYING
 1 POOR KIDS
 1 POOR SOURCE OF ENERGY
 1 POSSIBILITY FOR HUMAN
 1 POSSIBLE
 1 POTENTIALLY
 1 POVERTY
 1 PRACTICAL
 1 PRAIRIE
 1 PREJUDICE
 1 PREPARATION
 1 PREPAREDNESS
 1 PREVENT CONTAMINATION
 1 PREVENT NUCLEAR ACCIDENT
 1 PRIVATE
 1 PROBABLY HAS TO BE ADDRESSED
 1 PROBABLY HAVE THEM AND DON'T KNOW IT
 1 PROBLEM IN MINNESOTA
 1 PROBLEM SOLVING
 1 PROCESSED FOOD
 1 PRODUCERS
 1 PROLIFERATION OF HOSTILITIES
 1 PROPER
 1 PROPER DISPOSAL
 1 PROPERTY
 1 PUSHOVERS
 1 PUTATION
 1 QUALIFIED PEOPLE
 1 QUALITY
 1 RACED
 1 REACTION
 1 REACTIONARIES
 1 RED LIGHT
 1 RED SKY
 1 REDESIGN
 1 REDUCTION
 1 REJECTED
 1 REJECTION
 1 REPOSITORY
 1 REQUIREMENT
 1 RESPECT
 1 RESTRICTION
 1 RETALIATION
 1 RODS
 1 RUBBER SUIT
 1 RUNNING AWAY
 1 RURAL
 1 RUST
 1 RUSTING 55 GALLON BARRELS
 1 RUSTY
 1 SANITATION
 1 SATURATION OF SOILS
 1 SAVE ENERGY
 1 SAVE MY LIFE
 1 SAVING MONEY
 1 SCARCITY
 1 SCAVENGE
 1 SCHOOL
 1 SCHOOL AFFECTED
 1 SEGREGATED
 1 SELF DESTRUCTIVE
 1 SEPARATE
 1 SHARED
 1 SHEER POINTS
 1 SHIELDING
 1 SHIP AWAY
 1 SHORT RUN
 1 SHOULD BE LOCKED
 1 SHOULDN'T BE ALONE ANYWHERE
 1 SHOULDN'T BE FEAR
 1 SHOVED
 1 SKELETONS
 1 SKIN
 1 SOCIETY
 1 SOME FACILITY TO HOUSE THE PEOPLE
 1 SOMETHING NEW
 1 SOMETHING SHOULD BE DONE ABOUT IT
 1 SOMETHING THAT'S FUNNELED
 1 SORRY WE GOT NO OTHER
 1 SOVIET
 1 SPACE
 1 SPACE IT WOULD TAKE
 1 SPEAKERS
 1 STABLE
 1 STATES
 1 STEAM
 1 STERILE
 1 STOCKPILE
 1 STOP THE CAUSE
 1 STOPPAGE
 1 STORAGE OF DEADLY FUMES
 1 STORAGE OF NUCLEAR WASTE
 1 STORE STUFF
 1 STORING NUCLEAR WASTE
 1 STRESS
 1 STRESS POINTS
 1 SUBSTITUTE NUCLEAR
 1 SUICIDAL
 1 SUICIDE
 1 SUMMIT MEETING
 1 SUN
 1 SUPER COLLIDER
 1 SUPERFUND
 1 SURPRISE
 1 SURROUNDS US
 1 SWAMPS THAT ARE DARK
 1 TAKING ADVANTAGE OF ITS LOCATION
 1 TAKING CARE OF IT
 1 TAKING OUT SPACE
 1 TANGWANDA
 1 TEMPORARY
 1 TEST TUBE
 1 THERMO PLANTS
 1 THOUGHTLESS
 1 TO
 1 TO POINT WHERE IT IS PART OF LIFE
 1 TOO CLOSE
 1 TOO CLOSE TO HOME
 1 TOO MUCH
 1 TOUCHES EVERYTHING
 1 TOXIC ADVENTURE
 1 TRASH DOWN IN PLACE
 1 TRAVEL
 1 TREATIES
 1 TRYING TO GET UNDER CONTROL
 1 TUTONIUM
 1 U S
 1 UGLY LANDSCAPE
 1 UNFORTUNATELY
 1 UNIFORMED
 1 UNIFORMITY
 1 UNIMPOSING
 1 UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
 1 UNOBTRUSIVE STORAGE
 1 UNTOLD LIFE EXPECTANCY
 1 USING THE WASTE FOR PRACTICAL PURPOSES
 1 UTAHONA
 1 VALLEY
 1 VALUE
 1 VERY LITTLE VEGETATION
 1 VULNERABLE
 1 WASTE HAZARDS
 1 WASTE OF LIFE
 1 WASTE REDUCTION
 1 WASTE THE STATE OF OHIO
 1 WASTE TIME
 1 WASTED
 1 WATER CONTAINER
 1 WATER SEEPAGE
 1 WATER, DRY SURROUNDING
 1 WAY OFF

1 WE CAN DO IT IF WE PAY FOR IT
1 WE GOT OURSELVES INTO IT/ULTIMATE WASTE
1 WE HAVE TO PICK A PLACE TO HAVE IT
1 WE NEED ALL THE PROTECTION WE CAN GET
1 WE'LL BE DEAD/TAKING OVER POPULATION
1 WE'RE NOT FINDING A BETTER SOLUTION
1 WELL BUILT
1 WELL BUILT INCINERATORS
1 WEST
1 WHAT CAN I DO

1 WHAT CAN WE DO TO ELIMINATE IT
1 WHAT CITY
1 WHAT DO YOU WANT TO KNOW
1 WHAT THE HELL KIND OF QUESTION IS THAT
1 WHERE THEY PUT THE WASTE
1 WHITE SAND
1 WHO CLEANS UP MESS
1 WHOSE ABLE TO HANDLE IT
1 WIFE
1 WIRES ABOVE GROUND

1 WISH WASNT
1 WONDER
1 WORLDWIDE
1 WOULD HELP
1 WOULD NOT WANT TO LIVE
1 WOULD THEY GO OFF
1 WOW
1 YELLOW SUITS
