RECEIVED
FEB 02 2000

MS. DEVLIN: My name is Sally Devlin. I live here in Pahrump, Nevada and I want to thank you all for coming, and I'm so delighted to see such a nice audience and quite a few locals. That's wonderful.

I received this report from the Federal Register from Alan Benson, who I thank, and if I lie down and go to sleep, it's just because I had the 99 cent lunch which I highly recommend to everybody. There's a long waiting list. It's delicious.

1... Now I read this, and I'm going to go through the beginning of the end. The guidelines consistent with NRC 10 CFR Part 60 have been changed to -- from 60 to 113(C), and NWPA, Nuclear Waste Policy Act, really disturbs me because of the changes with the NRC and the EPA 10 CFR Part 63 on the total systems performance assessment, and NRC I feel is politically trying to change the rules, and I'm talking about the 4 millirems versus the 25 with NRC and the 15 versus the 25 with the air.

Now where our natural millirems in the air in Pahrump are 400 millirems, and the 25, I don't know how much difference that will make. Amargosa's is 420; it's a little higher in Beatty.

2 But what bothers me the most -- and I have stated it many times publicly -- is that the workers are allowed 5,000 millirems, and as the reports come out with Richardson stating that we have killed our people, this is very serious.

At Hanford, they had money for 2,500 cancer studies and a toll free number, and this was given to the board, and they had 40,000 people call in.

What we would have here at NTS -- and of course I do not exclude Yucca Mountain from NTS; it is all one, and that I'll bring out later.

The transparency, the validity, the scientific basis for the regulations and the empirical revolt -- results are not verifiable, and many will -- may evolve from drawn facts, but most of them are, as you know, my famous term of lay parents.

...1 So now on the 1992 EPA promulgated generally applicable standards for the protection of the environment, I am so afraid that these are going to be changed, and I am very disappointed that EPA was not at our last NWTRB meeting, and this -- this just says how much politics is in all this stuff.

Now the NRC established repository licensing requirement. Nobody knows who's going to do the licensing, and I had the full report from the NRC meeting on the criteria for the licensing.

3 Nobody knows who the five people are, and as you know, I will protest to my dying die and sue everybody until I die regarding the ten percent DOD high-level waste and classified waste going into Yucca Mountain.

There is no mention of this DOD stuff in this report, and it is very remiss on that.

The DOD is classified. Nobody knows who's going to do the declassification. They said the people from the EE -- from the NRC who we do not know, the five people will go into the declassification stuff because they have clearance.

I don't like to know nobody, nothing and what have you. This is absolutely reprehensible and fraud on the public and that's what we'll get you for.

In 1988, the structure of the plan was to describe the info deemed necessary to resolve outstanding issues.

The colloids are barely mentioned. My bugs, MCI, my microbic invasion is not mentioned at all, and this is a tremendous bone of contention because Sally's bugs, as we know from the Livermore than 12 million dollars test, were very viable. If the bugs eat the rock, then what's the use of the other stuff?

...1 It is dangerous to change the EPA's standards, and I won't go any more into that, but the health based standards that provide the public protection and they mentioned post-closure of repository would prevent risk of problems inside the repository beyond allowable limits 10,000 years.

Well, of course this is contradicted, and they say what will happen in a thousand years.

4 Now I've been around the horn a few times and I can only say they cannot say how long the repository will be opened fifty, a hundred, 300 years, and this is again a very ambiguous attitude of DOE, DOD, EPA and NRC, and I'm sure people don't realize how dangerous this is.

I will not talk about transportation. I will not talk about health, but the guideline contains a disqualifying condition of pre-waste emplacement because of the groundwater.

5 Now in the 1,600 pages of the EIS that I commented on, I said there's one line in there that really gets to me, and the DOE says if we have a flood, we are in big trouble, one line.

On the transportation, which I'll barely mention, there are two paragraphs saying they're differing with DOT. Now we all know DOT's record. That's the Department of Transportation.

At the chemical industries, at the plants, they had 250,000 accidents on the road. They had 260,000 accidents, and that's from '87 to '96, so that's a disastrous record.

6 When I did the EIS, I said for transportation, it would cost a trillion dollars because there is no infrastructure in this whole entire nation, and especially through the forty-three states, and especially through Nevada.

7... Now the one thing we did get at the end of our TRB meeting, and this was on the cost of the drip shields, and the first time it ever came out, and that was they wanted 5,000 to a hundred drip shields.

These are the things that are going over the canisters, and Judy and David were there so they can corroborate this, and they would not order them until 2060 and the cost would be three billion dollars in today's moneys.

...7 Now that's not only unacceptable, but you heard the date 2060, and I want to public to know that, because whether they're considering whether this will be lengthened because of all the suits and so on, including my own for fraud and color of office, I don't know.

8 The closure statements are true blue sky, and I use that in the stock market sense. As you know, I reported that the SEC had secret meetings. I gave the tapes for the information to Dr. Cohone and to Dr. Itkin and I'm waiting to get them back because this entire project, if anything goes up, and I'm talking about Price Andersen with the 500 million, 60 million for the attorneys, it would build half a casino in Las Vegas, and so this is totally inadequate.

My feeling is -- and I use the example of Fleur Daniels up at -- okay. I see Tom. That's your phone. I thought you were telling me -- giving me the hook.

Anyway, when Fleur Daniels getting an extra billion dollars because they don't know what they're doing taking the rods out of the water out at Hanford, and they are all corroded rods. They don't know how to handle that, and throwing a billion dollars extra at them when they don't know what they're doing is a direct relationship to what's going on here.

I really feel this is so political rather than practical, and this does scare me. I don't know where to go on this bill because it says absolutely nothing.

I should have come up with it because on the pages where it tells you all the things, as I say, the colloids are missing, the bugs are missing, transportation is missing.

There's a dozen things that are not in there, and then on the back part of it, it does mention the colloid, it does mention the bugs and so on, but of course I got into this almost seven years ago on transportation, and this bill, as far as I am concerned, is nothing but political double talk.

To change the laws again because I believe in transmutation and private business taking this over because it is too big a project for the DOE especially and the other organizations, that what we need is a Crowe or a Lee Iacocca, as I have expressed, to take it over and privatize it with plutonium worth 20,000 a gram.

And so I really feel that this is absolutely incomprehensible to the public and it is political and goes -- and really does not change anything except to pander to the politicians, not the public.

And I do have questions because I really didn't hear this eating my 99 cent lunch, which was delicious, and I do want to know what your goal is and the purpose of this, because I don't see anything except saying that there's only one site, and that's what I got out of the report.

The other stuff as far as the science goes, I didn't see too much change. I didn't see really any change, except the magic words, and that is the verifiability, validity and the scientific basis.

How much of that is going on and not how much politically is going on, I don't know.

There's much more I can say, but I hope there are others here to testify. I am looking particularly at the UNLV who got forty million from DOE and the presentation on the mountains, and I'm saying to myself how much political influence is that there?

And it's really very disturbing because what we need here in Pahrump is our water tested for radiation, nitrates, fluorides, pesticides, and so we fight over money and this is just like NRC and EPA and DOE and DOD and so on.

9 With DOE, I will absolutely not allow the secret stuff classified in my mountain, and how NRC can even entertain anything to do the licensing, I do not know, but this will come up and this will go to court.

So it's very important, and I thank you again for coming down here, but as you hear my ambivalence about this, the only change was that there's one repository.

10 The rest of it, if you go with NRC standards versus EPA standards, not acceptable. I will not have the Pure Water Drinking Act from 4 millirems to almost 26, which is six times more. That will kill us all, as well as the millirems in the air, and I want it brought out to the public that the workers have 5,000 millirems.

We do not discuss transportation because there isn't any. We do not discuss the design for the repository. There isn't any. We do not design -- talk about the canisters because there aren't any, and if they look in Alloy 22 and others, you'll see my bugs will eat them happily.

The other stuff is falling apart and there's much more science going on, and I know you all are aware of it and we try to keep up on it.

11 But the one thing that bothers me, as I showed my friend Bill the pound and a half report on the isotopes and the Actonides that will kill us all, and I'm going to do a report on that because they're in the air, they're in the water, they're everywhere, and this will kill 43 states if it is continued to continue without leaving everything on-site, and that's my contention.

12 So whether this bill goes through, I don't think it makes much difference as long as they don't change the rules to make the requirements less rather than more.

And thank you.