

FEB 22 2000

EIS002256

MR. HADDER: Yes. For the record, my name is John Hadder, and I work with a Nevada-based nonprofit, Citizen Alert. I am from Reno, Nevada. And a few points I want to make here.

1 First of all, I would like to -- Citizen Alert would request that this whole process certainly be extended, and certainly be -- and back up a second.

2 I asked a question during the question-and-answer period regarding the site recommendation process and whether there would be information that would be uniquely given to the president, different from what the public will have a chance to see.

3 And the answer I got back I thought was not very useful; but nevertheless, it was indicated that there is certainly some doubt of whether it will be unique information or not. So Citizen Alert is concerned about that, that the public has access to all the information that's going to go to the president and proper comment has been made on all the information, included within the information -- or as part of that information -- there are two studies outstanding that we believe are important for really examining the viability of Yucca Mountain that haven't been completed yet. One is a fluid inclusion study which should be completed sometime -- I think by the end of this year or the beginning of next year. And also there's another study which involves satellite information on seismic stretching around the Yucca Mountain area, which would, I believe, also be completed sometime next year.

The fluid inclusion study is one which indicates the possibility of thermal water up-welling into the repository. This could be a very significant impact to the immediate area around Yucca Mountain as well as further away from Yucca Mountain.

It is indicated in the DEIS, but the time as to when the last potential thermal up-welling occurred has not been clearly defined, at least by science.

Like I said, it mentions -- and that's what this study is for -- it clearly defines whether it was thermal water that up-welled into the repository cavity. And so we want these studies completed before recommendations go to the president and for final public comment, as well as the satellite studies indicate movement around the project. In fact, as of November of 1988, the information at that time indicated that the crust was moving at 20 times the rate previously thought.

So we thought this study also should be completed before the final recommendation is made and for full public comment on that as well. So we believe that certainly with those two studies, along with other information that I commented on earlier that the DEIS is definitely deficient in that regard.

People should be wary of people with degrees waving them around like they know everything. This is an article from "Science," dated November 1958, "Genetic and Somatic Effects of Carbon 14," Linus Pauling.

This paper, along with other papers that Linus Pauling had done, was part of what resulted in an above-ground test-ban treaty that was signed in 1963. So the point being is, yes, there are definitely effects, and they are well documented.

Be careful of people that might have other vested interests at hand. How much time do I have left?

FACILITATOR HOLMES: Two minutes.

4... MR. HADDER: Two minutes. In the purpose of public process, I would also like to indicate that the -- in this document, there is a no-action sort of two scenarios that are considered here. And I quote from the

...4 National Environmental Policy Act, that the Secretary of Energy shall not (sic) be required to consider the need for repository, the alternative to geologic disposal, or alternative sites to the Yucca Mountain site. "Need not" is a critical word there.

The DOE has been hiding behind this for some time. And I realize that there has been considerable political pressure on that. So this is one reason that the Citizen Alert demanded this whole process be revisited, because it was obvious that there was political pressure on the DOE to move in that direction, although they did have the opportunity to explore other alternatives, besides the -- as they say in their own analysis, the not feasible no-action alternative considered in this document.

There are other alternatives that out there that could have been explored, and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act allows that to happen; although it did indicate "need none." And I think that's an important point.

Because I don't have very much time, there's one other point I would like to make about the no-action alternative, as is discussed. I think it has the -- the way it is written in this document, it tends to set up sort of a straw-man argument for the whole idea of on-site storage. I think it was indicated earlier that that is an opportunity.

5 And I would like to make a comment to this effect. On page 279 of this document, there's sort of a summary no-action versus action. And in this bullet point it indicates that, um, projected radiological impacts to the public for the first 10,000 years for the proposed action, that would be Yucca Mountain, would be as low as -- it looks like 10 to the minus 4th, 10 to the minus 4, latent cancer fatalities that year. Compared to the no-action Scenario 2, where there would be 3300 latent cancer fatalities, which would mean that you leave it at the site for a hundred years, and then you walk away from it completely.

Well, of course, there's going to be a whole lot more cancer fatalities. This whole section of the summary tends to cast the two scenarios under the no-action together -- as all no action. And it also connects that with on-site storage at the same time. And so it appears to me as though there's a biased presentation in this document. And I can go into more detail in written comments about that, the no-action -- that the on-site storage is not viable, by taking the worst of each of these two scenarios and putting them both forward as the no-action on site storage makes no -- on-site storage look untenable, which Citizen Alert does not believe is the case.

6 There are alternatives here, and we think they should have been explored in this process. And that is one of the reasons that we believe that the whole process is flawed and needs to be revisited, and probably not by the Department of Energy, who has been politically connected to the process, as well as the nuclear industry. I think that's all the time I have, so thank you.

FACILITATOR HOLMES: Thanks very much.

And we have John Stevens.