RECEIVED
OCT 21 1999

6 MS. ZELLER: My name is Janet Zeller. I'm
7 executive director of the Blue Ridge Environmental
8 Defense League. We are a league of more than 40
9 active community organizations, and we span three
10 states. We also work skirmish into South Carolina
11 on occasion in addition to our work in North
12 Carolina and Tennessee and Virginia.
13 And the official position of the Blue Ridge
14 Environmental Defense League board of directors is
1
15 as follows. We have these recommendations. First,
16 abandon the failed site at Yucca Mountain. It has
17 been proven to be a faulty site for a geologic
18 disposal. Number two, we want military waste,
19 irradiated fuel, transuranic waste stored on site,
2 20 preferably as close to the point of generation as
21 is safe, while the Department of Energy goes back
22 to the drawing board to put together a real waste
23 management program. Number three, we want the
3 24 Nuclear Waste Fund -- and I pay it as a rate payer
25 down in Duke Power country -- to go to subsidize

1 the reactor or near-point-of-generation storage
2 while the DOE actually goes to work. And number
3 four, we want a true and long-term, forever
4 commitment to no reprocessing of irradiated fuel.
5 This position is part of a position that
6 IEER, the Institute for Energy and Environmental
7 Research, has put together, and citizens' groups
8 from across the country have signed onto this
9 position. So there are a lot of people who are
10 saying the same things as we are, whether they had
11 the opportunity to come to a hearing or not.
12 I won't go into those parts of my written
13 comments that are repetitious, but I would like to
14 say that in 1984 DOE came to North Carolina to set
15 up the Crystalline repository project, and I first
16 learned what non-geologic disposal is. And that's
17 not what you're doing at Yucca Mountain. There is
18 no non-geologic repository that, as DOE officials
19 from the Chicago operations office assured us,
20 would mean that the wastes would be withheld from
21 the biosphere, safeguarded from the biosphere, for
22 a period of 10,000 years. The site itself is
23 supposed to be a barrier for the entire control
24 period, and that's not what's happening here.
25 Further, we're very concerned about some of

1 the technical reviews that have taken place in the
2 last couple of years about the Department of
3 Energy's work on containers. Alloy C-22, for
4 example, under certain conditions, can be not
5 passive and so can actually have penetration and a
6 continued 6 loss of integrity in only a few tens of years. So
7 relying on containers is just not going to be
8 workable, and pretending that there is a solution
9 to the waste management problem is a grave danger
10 because there are real problems to high-level
11 nuclear waste. And pretending that there's a
12 solution just creates the incentive on the part of
13 industry to extend their life, like Duke at Oconee
14 1, 2 and 3, and as nuclear utilities across the
15 country are going to the NRC to do right now. So
16 pretending that you've got a solution causes a
17 much bigger problem.
18 In addition, absolutely no utility that
7
19 increases the danger of high-level nuclear waste
20 that they produce should be a part of the program,
21 anyway. In that I'm talking specifically about
22 Duke Energy and about Virginia Power because they
23 have a very ill-conceived and dangerous plan to
24 use -- at the taxpayers' expense, of course -- the
25 weapons-grade plutonium at the power plants

7 continued

1 McGuire I and II in North Carolina, Catawba I and
2 II in South Carolina and Virginia in Louisa
3 County, North Anna I and II. And so no utility
4 that takes on additional dangers in either the
5 actual hazard or the amount of the waste should be
6 a part of this program at all.
7 And the DOE says, actually, that those of us
8 that live in North Carolina who live around the
9 McGuire plant and the Catawba plant, that only
10 eight percent more of us would die in case of an
11 accident. Now, Nuclear Control Institute has, of
12 course, much higher calculations; and I believe
13 them and not you. The Department of Energy has a
14 credibility problem. When y'all came to my state
15 back in 1984 and '85 and '86, you told us that
16 transportation was going to be factored in before
17 the sites were actually narrowed. You told us
18 that we should trust your judgment when you picked
19 a site in western North Carolina for a Crystalline
20 repository that -- as one of the 12 best in the
21 entire nation, where the ground water circulated
22 at 2,000 feet and you didn't even know it. I mean,
23 this is not -- this is not good science, and you
24 can't just keep doing this. If the people of this
25 country are going to bear the burden as Congress

8

10

10 continued

said we are supposed to in 1982, you've got to do a decent job and make sure that our dollars as taxpayers are spent wisely and that our health as citizens of this country is protected. Those are your main responsibilities. And so far, I see only a papering over of those responsibilities and a kowtowing to the people who are really in control, the nuclear utilities.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

MS. SWEENEY: Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Leo Goldberg. I guess it isn't Leo Goldberg. Gwen Carroll. Incidentally, Ms. Carroll is the last person that I have on my list. Is there anyone else who would like to speak following Ms. Carroll?