

JAN 11 2000

EIS002149

JOHN HADDER

MR. HADDER: Good evening, everyone. My name is John Hadder and I work for an organization called Citizen Alert. We've been working on this issue for a very long time, and so we're old friends, the Department of Energy or whatever, and I just have a few comments that I want to make that haven't really been addressed too much tonight.

1 First of all, here's volume 1. I hope many of you have looked through it. One thing I want to point out about this is if you look in the table of contents right away, you start out with nothing in bold and you start reading. "The affected environment; the affected environment of Yucca Mountain repository; conclusion 10; land use and ownership; land use and ownership; current use; land use and ownership; potential repository withdrawal; Native American treaty issues; air quality," blah-blah-blah-blah. How do you find anything in that? So my first comment is that the way this is set up is not easy to find information. It's not clearly defined. It's not delineated in a fashion which makes it easy.

It takes me a little time, a lot of time just to find out what I'm looking for in the document, so that's one thing about the document itself that I'd like to see improved on is it's a ability to find information. It would be nice to have a little bit of an index, maybe or something like that. So that's one thing right off the bat with this thing. It's probably -- it's probably got a lot of people baffled from the beginning.

The second thing there's two volumes of this. This is only volume 1. It's a lot of work. You guys put a lot of work into it. I appreciate that. A lot of time in creating something like this. This stuff -- there's other things that are a lot of work, too. If I do this a thousand times, that's a lot of work. So I would like to point out that while there's a lot of work put in this document, it also has to be information that's useful to the public and easy to find. So please focus on -- on what this is for, public process for people to understand what's going on and is this going to be a safe action for all the people in the United States?

2 Another issue I'd like to address is the transportation one very briefly. There are three things that are really important in this transportation problem. There's the testing we've heard about. There's real live accident scenarios, which we don't hear about too much and you don't really hear about them very much in this thing at all, and then there's the models which we hear a lot about. These three are three pieces that have to be connected, and to me and to Citizen Alert that the analysis, the risk analysis in this document, the transportation analysis is not complete unless those three concepts are connected.

How do the tests that we keep hearing about connect to real world accidents? That needs to be connected for people to understand. How do the models connect to real world accidents and the tests? That needs to be connected for people to understand the impacts. That is the responsibility of our federal agencies, the DOE and the NRC, and though that connection has not been made.

3 There have been no full scale tests done on these casks. We're not even quite sure what designs we're going to use to transport it, I believe, so that needs to be thoroughly explored for the public to have any kind of appreciation or any kind of belief in what is being put out, and that is the responsibility of the Federal Government. Question about the siting guidelines. The Department of Energy back in 1984 or 4 '85 set up guidelines to characterize siting characterization guidelines for Yucca Mountain. They're changing those now. In fact, there's a hearing coming up I believe in a couple weeks to change them.

What impact does that have on the environmental analysis? And why are they being changed, anyway? What was wrong with the original ones? I'd like to have that answered at some point. What else is going to be revised before when this thing goes out? Anything else? Any other surprises? So we want to be absolutely clear that there's going to be no other changes to this evolving process we keep hearing about.

5... The evolving repository design. Interesting. Wouldn't like to buy an evolving car design? Oh, we

- ...5 decided to change the brakes in mid-flight? Okay. So let's kind of try to keep it solid and keep it design solid so we can really evaluate the impacts of the future. |
- 6 One more point real briefly is that it was brought up a little bit. | In the no action alternative, there's been a lot of talk about how well, we can't keep the stuff on-site because of all the potential dangers with on-site storage, which -- the on-site no action alternative in this document is -- is not very well addressed, and one of the issues that keeps coming up is oh, there's all this problem with flooding. I looked in this thing and I looked in volume 2 and I didn't really see a flood analysis in there, and I would be happy if you want to point it out to me if it's in there. So if it's such a big problem, then explain how it's a big problem, why it's going to be such a big problem to have on-site storage in areas which are relatively near to water, to water facilities, which is what one of the big arguments I've been hearing. So I'd like to see that addressed in this document, as well. |

That is all I'm going to say for now. Citizen Alert will submit more comments later. Thank you very much for your time and I appreciate everyone that's come out tonight. Thank you for listening.