

RECEIVED

EIS000515

24        NOV 16 1999        MS. GUY: My name is Peggy Guy. I'm a  
25        concerned citizen and resident of Denver for the past

1 20 years. I'm a middle school health and physical  
2 education teacher. In my 20 years of teaching I have  
3 coached and taught thousands of young people.

4 While I do not possess the credentials to  
5 permit me to address the scientific technological  
6 aspects of the transport of high-level radioactive  
7 waste, I do bring a measure of common sense that is  
8 rarely appreciated in a culture increasingly  
9 characterized by a tyranny of the experts.

10 I am compelled to speak today for those  
11 voices who have been silenced by nuclear illness, and  
12 particularly for my mother, who tried for many years  
13 prior to her death from a rare abdominal cancer to get  
14 the DOE to acknowledge the role of radiation exposure  
15 at Oak Ridge in her illness. She would be proud that  
16 her efforts were not buried with her.

17 This is my first appearance at such a  
18 hearing, but it will not be my last. As a long-time  
19 resident of the Denver area, I am well aware of the  
20 dangers of travel on I-70. Anybody who spends much  
21 time in the mountains can attest to the long hours one  
22 spends sitting in weekend traffic on the proposed  
23 nuclear waste transport route.

24 As I read the Denver Post and Rocky  
25 Mountain News on Monday morning, I came across a report

1 of an accident that served to heighten my concerns  
2 about the transport of waste through Denver. On  
3 Saturday, November 13, around 6 p.m., a tractor/trailer  
4 was westbound on I-70 heading for, oddly enough, Las  
5 Vegas.

6 The truck was loaded with 36,000 pounds of  
7 ribs and prime rib from the Monfort Packing Plant in  
8 Greeley. The driver, Richard Kerr, 25, lost brake  
9 control around 6 p.m. Saturday in I-70's westbound lane  
10 near Silverthorne. The car tried to get into the  
11 runaway truck lane, but there was too much traffic.

12 His truck hit a roadside post, flipped,  
13 slid across three lanes of traffic, ran off the left  
14 side of the road, hit the guardrail, landed in the  
15 eastbound lane, turned on its left side, broke apart,  
16 and burst into flames.

17 Troopers closed I-70 from Silverthorne to  
18 the Eisenhower Tunnel until 5:30 p.m. Sunday,  
19 approximately 11 and a half hours.

20 Sir, I am not a nuclear physicist, but I'm  
21 afraid all the assurances in the world from the nuclear  
22 experts will not convince me that had this flaming  
23 tractor/trailer met up with a 125 ton truck carrying  
24 high-level radioactive waste, a grave situation would  
25 not have developed.

1           Despite some sophomoric effort by the  
2 Rocky Mountain News to joke about where's the beef, and  
3 about burning diesel fuel not being the best of  
4 marinades, I failed to see the humor in the situation.

5           I could not help but wonder how you would  
6 address such an event. Several questions came to mind  
7 as I pondered that possibility.

8           What are -- and you may have addressed  
9 some of these concerns earlier, I do not know. I was  
10 not here for those comments -- [what are the failure  
11 thresholds on the casks that will carry the waste? How  
12 long and how hot must a fire burn before release of  
13 material from a cask occurs? Is it true that your cask  
14 testing has only been done through computer  
15 simulations? Why has that information not been shared  
16 with the public through your Environmental Impact  
17 Statements.]

18           Other safety issues have not been  
19 adequately addressed. I'm sure most of them have been  
20 already documented through the hearings. I will  
21 restate them for the record.

2           [The EIS seems to pay little attention to  
3 the prevention of human error.] [In addition, there's no  
24 requirement for armed guards except in urban areas to  
25 prevent possible terrorist attacks.]

4 1 I question whether communities on the  
2 transport route will be adequately trained to respond  
3 to a nuclear emergency. What if such a nuclear  
4 accident happened in downtown Denver when we had  
5 concurrent events such as a Bronco games, a Rocky game,  
6 and perhaps a concert at the Pepsi Center. Have you  
7 addressed the need for evacuation routes?

5... 8 What I find most troubling has been the  
9 response to a petition to the Secretary of Energy in  
10 November 1998, and signed by more than 200  
11 environmental and public interest groups. The document  
12 expressed concern about the failure of the Yucca  
13 Mountain site to pass site suitability guidelines  
14 established by the DOE for the burial of radioactive  
15 waste.

16 Among the facts documented in the petition  
17 are that the site of the Yucca Mountain repository is  
18 as seismically active as the California bay area,  
19 having experienced more than 600 earthquakes within a  
20 50-mile radius of the proposed burial site within the  
21 last 20 years.

22 The DOE response was not to address the  
23 concerns with more scientific technological research,  
24 but to change the site suitability guidelines. If we  
25 set a precedent for violating our own safety guidelines

5 cont.

1 on Yucca Mountain, what compromises await us on other  
2 environmentally flawed projects that may lie ahead?

3 More importantly, what is the message we send  
4 to the private contractors who will carry the waste on  
5 the highways and railways when we blatantly violate our  
6 own safety standards. What if, in an effort to make a  
7 profit, the privatized carriers follow the DOE example  
8 of compromising safety standards? What will be the  
9 financial liability when an accident occurs? Are the  
10 private carriers protected from lawsuits by individuals  
11 harmed by toxic exposures? What will be the  
12 liabilities of the federal government in the case of  
13 contamination of an area, and the individuals who live  
14 within it? Will the burden fall once again upon the  
15 taxpayers?

16 If the past behavior of the nuclear  
17 industry and the federal government reflects the future  
18 behavior of both entities in responding to the pleas of  
19 workers for addressing nuclear safety issues and  
20 nuclear illness issues, I fear we are in grave danger.

21 Although under federal law, employees  
22 cannot punish -- employers cannot punish employees who  
23 question health and safety practices at their place of  
24 employment, there's ample evidence that whistle-blower  
25 laws continue to be violated at nuclear facilities

4

1 around the countries.

6 2 Perhaps the most distressing concern I  
3 have at this point is the use of clever statistical  
4 analyses that suggest there will be no significant  
5 radiological impact to individuals from the transport  
6 of high-level radioactive waste to Yucca Mountain. One  
7 of your own engineers stated in 1994 he expects there  
8 will be at least four to six accidents that involve the  
9 release of radioactivity. I wondered as I read that if  
10 he is still with you.

11 When asked how he reconciled these  
12 estimates with the idea of no significant radiological  
13 impact, he responded that the radiation exposures were  
14 averaged across the entire U.S. population. I can  
15 assure you the reality of the effects of radiation  
16 exposure for those affected is not assuaged by the  
17 clever use of statistics.

7 18 The transportation of high-level  
19 radioactive waste to Yucca Mountain represents a  
20 political solution to a scientific technological  
21 problem. Yes, the waste is dangerous where it is, but  
22 much less dangerous than it would be traveling the  
23 highways and rail systems of this country, and  
24 ultimately being stored in the environmentally flawed  
25 facility at Yucca Mountain.

1                   Please address in your Environmental  
2           Impact Statement the questions and concerns that have  
3           been raised in these hearings by the people of Colorado  
4           and citizens across the country who want sane solutions  
5           to the storage problems posed by the continued  
6           production of nuclear energy. Thank you.

7                   MR. BROWN: Susan Maret? She's not here.

8                   We have one other person signed up. I  
9           hope I have the name correct. Charlotte Pustek?