

RECEIVED

EIS000379

NOV 04 1999

13 THE FACILITATOR: All right. Sharon Rose.

14 MS. ROSE: I work for an organization called  
15 Healthy Communities, which is working on preserving the  
16 quality of life and improving it here in Inyo County, and  
17 I'm here tonight as a private citizen. For the last 25  
18 years, I've been an environmental writer, a journalist, a  
19 health educator, and I've also been working in the field of  
20 cancer prevention.

21 First of all, I wanted to say something  
22 about mitigation and where that concept comes from. In the  
23 original NEPA Act and the Environmental Protection Acts  
24 that were passed in the 1970s, the idea of mitigation was  
25 to compensate. If we did something in the forest that

1

3 1 damaged trees, then we would plant trees somewhere else.  
2 When we talk about ionizing radiation, it's something that  
3 just about cannot be mitigated.

4                   The effects of ionizing radiation have been  
5 well documented from as far back as Hiroshima, Nagasaki, up  
6 to more recently Chernobyl, and even in this country Three  
7 Mile Island, and some of these things are too recent for us  
8 to have the data yet to know how to evaluate them. These  
9 cancers have now had time to incubate, and we really don't  
10 know what the effects are.

1... 11                   As far as the nuclear accident involving  
12 trucking transport, it's been stated that there are  
13 potentially an estimated 40,000 trucking accidents a year  
14 in the US. If that's true, it means that the potential of  
15 an accident is quite high, and that brings me back to this  
16 thought about mitigation and how do you mitigate this sort  
17 of an accident with these kinds of materials? Because we  
18 know that ionizing radiation has effects. Some of the  
19 things that it causes are leukemia, birth defects, mental  
20 retardation, and physical deformations, cancers. So,  
21 essentially, there's really no mitigation.

22                   It was stated here tonight that there is a  
23 cleanup fund, and there's legislation that ensures that if  
24 there's an accident, there's plenty of money to clean it  
25 up. But the problem that I see with this is that it's not

1 cont. | 1 really a matter of money. How do you mitigate cancer or  
2 | 2 how do you mitigate deformed babies? These sorts of things  
3 | 3 are just not easily remedied.

4 | Another thing that I wanted to point out is  
5 | that in terms of this law, it's, essentially, negating the  
2 6 | earlier requirements of NEPA. [ And what I think needs to  
7 | happen here in terms of this EIS is that the no-action  
8 | alternative needs to be considered, and in my opinion  
9 | that's one of the deficiencies of this EIS, is that the  
10 | no-action alternative isn't very much considered. The only  
11 | way to prevent a nuclear accident, a trucking accident, is  
12 | to have no trucking. So I think that the no-action  
13 | alternative needs to be revisited and reconsidered in this  
14 | EIS, and there should be no trucking, no transportation of  
15 | waste, of high-level nuclear waste by trucks or by rail. ]

16 | Thank you.

17 | MR. SKIPPER: Thank you for your comments.

18 | THE FACILITATOR: That concludes the list of folks  
19 | who had signed up to make comment. So I would ask now if  
20 | there's anybody else in the audience who would like to make  
21 | a comment, and also to remind you if you had asked any  
22 | questions during the question and answer period and wanted  
23 | to follow up those questions by making a comment for the  
24 | record, now is a good time to do that.

25 | So we have -- yes.