

PUBLIC STATEMENT OF JOHN SPITZNER

DEC 01 1989

MR. SPITZNER: My name is John Spitzner. I'll keep my comments short to assist the court reporter. I appreciate you taking the additional time in delaying your break.

1 Basically what this environmental impact statement is lacking is a real alternative look at what can be done here. The process is flawed, as many people have testified earlier here.

On record, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, the Nuclear Waste Projects Office, as well as the Department of Energy itself, state that for the next hundred years, we can keep the waste on site safely. When we're looking at this -- the overall look at 10,000 years, that's a significant amount of time. 100 years out of 10,000.

Why don't we consider this. This is not even considered as part of the proposal. Or in essence, your no action alternative doesn't really address what has gone on record.

If you think about where we were a hundred years ago technologically, did we have airplanes? Think what can happen in 100 years. We can safely store it on site, the Department of Energy has gone on record as saying that. So why isn't that really considered here? Thank you very much.