

RECEIVED

OCT 21 1999

EIS000273

16                   MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Robert  
17 Halstead, and he'll be followed by Lou Long and  
18 Betsy Palmer.

19                   MR. HALSTEAD: Barry, do I get Joe Strolin's  
20 five minutes?

21                   MR. LAWSON: Yes; actually, you do. I was  
22 informed about that. That's correct. Just to  
23 explain, Mr. Halstead, I believe, has comments of  
24 his own and has been asked by another official to  
25 enter in some oral comments from that person as

1

1 well.

2 MR. HALSTEAD: Good afternoon. In order to  
3 comply with the ten-minute time limit, I'm going  
4 to request that my entire written statement be  
5 entered into the record and that my comments be  
6 added to the record as a supplement to the  
7 statement. And that way, hopefully, Barry, I  
8 won't have to use that whole ten minutes. I do  
9 plan to incorporate some new supplemental  
10 reference materials for the record, including  
11 yesterday's Atlanta Journal-Constitution front-  
12 page description of the "Nightmare at I-85" and  
13 the business section, "Such a Mess on I-85." And  
14 at the end I'll talk about why this incident  
15 underscores the importance of looking at the  
16 actual routes that may be used for shipments so  
17 that risks can be appropriately evaluated and so  
18 that mitigation measures for managing and reducing  
19 those risks can be developed.

20 Representative McCall's comments reminded me  
6... 21 that Georgia had an opportunity to get this  
22 repository in Georgia in 1986 when sites were  
23 identified by the Department of Energy in granite  
24 rock bodies in eastern states. But it was a  
25 political and not a technical decision by the

6 cont. 1 Congress to target Yucca Mountain only for  
2 consideration for a repository. Now, we in Nevada  
3 might feel differently about all this if all the  
4 other sites had been appropriately evaluated the  
5 way the 1982 federal law said they would be. But  
6 then in 1986 all the eastern folks with all the  
7 electoral votes got very concerned about their  
8 backyards, and they decided to dump it in ours.  
9 And you need to understand that this whole debate  
10 since 1986 has been, unfortunately, in my opinion,  
11 unnecessarily adversarial because of the political  
12 decision. So it was political science and not  
13 earth science that chose Yucca Mountain as the  
14 candidate site.

1 15 Furthermore, I think, unfortunately, in the  
16 last ten years we've learned more about the  
17 problems with geologic disposal than we have about  
18 how to make geologic disposal work. And so one of  
19 the concerns we have in Nevada is, as a matter of  
20 national policy, that we need to rethink the whole  
21 idea that geologic disposal is something that we  
22 know how to do right now as opposed to something  
23 that we might do better ten or twenty years down  
24 the road after we buy ourselves some more time  
25 with extended at-reactor storage, which, I will

1  
continued

1 remind you, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has  
2 assured us is safe for 50 to 100 years at the  
3 sites where it's currently located.

2

4 The central issue which underlies all my  
5 comments today has to do with the Department of  
6 Energy's failure to provide route-specific  
7 transportation information in the Draft EIS. Now,  
8 in order for people to participate in the NEPA  
9 process, they have to be afforded an opportunity  
10 to know that a major federal action has a  
11 potential to impact them and their communities. I  
12 believe that everything you've heard today says  
13 that, while at this meeting the DOE has done a  
14 good job of saying where those transportation  
15 impacts will be in Atlanta, if you just read that  
16 Draft EIS you wouldn't know a thing about impacts  
17 on Atlanta and other cities in the south like  
18 Nashville along the transportation corridors.

3

19 There are three specific issues that I would  
20 like to comment on today with regard to  
21 transportation. First is the way that the modal-  
22 mix scenario is considered in the Draft EIS. And  
23 I don't want to make this such a technical  
24 discussion in traffic planner's jargon that folks  
25 who don't do this for a living feel lost. It

1 comes down to this. The DOE has taken what they  
2 call a bounding scenario approach. They've said  
3 "Let's think if all the shipments are made by  
4 truck and let's think if all the shipments are  
5 made by rail, and that will capture all the  
6 adverse impacts." And in a generic proceeding,  
7 that would be an appropriate way to proceed. Now,  
8 this is a site-specific proceeding dealing with  
9 shipments from 80 sites where they know where they  
10 are to one site, which we unfortunately know where  
11 it's likely to be. And we've been studying this  
12 stuff for 20 years, so we know the routes, we know  
13 which reactors are likely to be able to ship by  
14 rail and by truck.

15 So the State of Nevada actually hired  
16 consultants to independently develop what we think  
17 is the most likely and the most impacting  
18 scenario; we call that a current-capabilities  
19 scenario. | And I've described it in my testimony.  
20 By the way, anybody who doesn't have a copy of the  
21 statement, I have more copies here that I'll  
22 spread out. | And what this says to us is the  
23 likely impacts are somewhere between those  
24 extremes, and in order to really capture the  
25 impacts you have to look at that actual mixed

3  
continued

3  
continued

1 scenario of 14,000 rail shipments and 25,000 truck  
2 shipments under the proposed action up to as many  
3 as 25,000 truck shipments and 15,000 rail  
4 shipments under their module-two scenario. And  
5 then you map those on the map to see who's going  
6 to be affected by those shipments, and I've  
7 attached those maps to my statements.

8 Second point -- How are we doing on time,  
9 Barry?

10 MR. LAWSON: You're halfway through.

4

11 MR. HALSTEAD: Good, I'm halfway through.

12 Second point: the Draft EIS fails to  
13 identify the cross-country routes that DOE  
14 studied. Now, I could answer that question that I  
15 posed to Wendy earlier today, but then I'd eat up  
16 all that five minutes. And there are all kinds of  
17 good technical reasons why you might not want to  
18 say, "Well, these are the routes you're going to  
19 use." And that's why the approach we've developed  
20 in Nevada reflects that. We say, "Look, here are  
21 the most likely routes if we were to start  
22 shipping tomorrow under the status quo  
23 assumptions, the way the nuclear business runs."  
24 And then we further said, "There are a whole bunch  
25 of things that could change the way we do business

1 under the status quo." Like in Nevada we might  
2 decide we're not going to allow these thousands of  
3 truck shipments and rail casks to go through  
4 downtown Las Vegas within a quarter mile of the  
5 Vegas strip, and we're going to designate  
6 alternate routes. And that would change the entry  
7 points, and that changes the routes back across  
8 the country; maybe that makes I-40 look like a  
9 better route than I-70.

10 This is not magic; it's science. It's social  
11 science, I'll grant you. But there's a way to do  
12 it with -- in a repeatable manner with evidence  
4 continued 13 that can be cited. So it's not a mystery where  
14 these impacts are going to go. And in my statement  
15 I've given you the routes that we in Nevada have  
16 identified as the primary crosscountry routes. We  
17 think DOE should do the same, both for what they  
18 think is the most likely scenario and for what  
19 they think is the most likely alternative  
20 scenario. |

5 21 Finally, | the Draft EIS -- my third point --  
22 fails to provide meaningful information on local  
23 and regional impacts. Folks who understand the  
24 transportation system in the south know that hub  
25 cities like Nashville and Atlanta are probably

1 going to be affected by this. The Draft EIS ought  
2 to tell people that, and it ought to give people  
3 some information to allow them to determine the  
4 impacts. In my statement I've developed some  
5 tables that show the number of shipments that  
6 might come through Atlanta, the number of  
7 shipments that might go through Nashville under  
8 the mostly truck scenario. And the reason that we  
9 use this approach in planning is not just to put  
10 political heat on the Department of Energy, which  
11 is their assumption every time we raise the  
12 routing issue. It's, frankly, that it's as much  
13 for their benefit as for our benefit. Department  
14 of Energy transportation planners have to know  
15 that this can happen in Atlanta. They have to  
16 hear what DeKalb County police major Gene Moss  
17 said yesterday: "This has been a nightmare. On  
18 the biggest thoroughfare with the biggest  
19 intersection in the southeast, plus the Braves  
20 game and rush hour, it couldn't have happened at a  
21 worse time." DOE's people have to know those  
22 conditions.

23 In the transportation business there is a  
24 principle that we all live by whether we're adding  
25 guard rails or putting a road shoulder on an

5  
continued

1 existing road or, God forbid, building a new  
2 Interstate through your community. It is: You  
3 look for the interaction between general system  
4 requirements and unique local conditions. And the  
5 only way you find out about the unique local  
6 conditions is to identify the location of your  
7 potential impacts and have a meeting like this one  
8 and allow local people and their elected  
9 representatives to come and talk these issues  
10 through and see how to manage these problems. |  
11 That's all we're asking for regarding the routing  
12 process here: that, one, the DOE considers the  
13 most realistic modal mix; two, they identify the  
14 most likely crosscountry rail and highway routes;  
15 and, three, they identify the local and regional  
16 transportation impacts. Thank you very much.

17 MS. SWEENEY: Thank you.

18 MR. LAWSON: Did you have a statement from  
19 somebody else?

20 MR. HALSTEAD: I've incorporated Strolin's  
21 comments; they're in the  
22 introductory part of my statement.

23 MR. LAWSON: Okay. Our next speaker will be  
24 Lou Long, and I understand that Mr. Long would  
25 like to speak toward the end of the session. So

1 following Mr. Long will be Susan Clark and Lauren  
2 McDonald.