

RECEIVED

FEB 22 2000

EIS002236

MR. LAURIE: Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. My name is Robert Laurie. I am a commissioner at the California Energy Commission; and in that capacity, I also act as California's liaison to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The California Energy Commission is the lead state agency assigned to respond to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Accordingly, the formal statement which had been previously docketed, which is a large technical statement, which will not be presented today, it has been earlier presented, represents the views of 13 state agencies.

So today I am responding on behalf of the following state agencies: The California Department of Conservation, the Department of Fish and Game, the Department of Health and Services, the Department of Parks and Recreation, Transportation and Water Resources, as well as the Governor's Office of Emergency Services, the California Highway Patrol, the California Public Utilities Commission, the Toxic Substances Control Board, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board, as well as the California Energy Commission.

Thus, what has been presented is the position of the agencies of the State of California.

I had previously submitted to the reporter a prepared statement; I will not read that prepared statement, only summarize, so the audience knows what our position is.

1

It's the position of the agencies of the State of California that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is legally deficient pursuant to the provisions of NEPA. And it is deficient in our view, in the following areas: It fails to sufficiently consider transportation impacts. It is understood that it is the position of the federal government to further define routes.

Well, routes formally or informally have been defined. We know that the law dictates that when you define a project, it must be the project as a whole; you cannot bifurcate your analysis.

In this case, there has been a gross failure to analyze the specific routes through the areas especially outside the State of Nevada.

The EIS also fails to fully evaluate route alternatives. It fails to identify and analyze potential route-specific and model-specific impact to population and the environment along the shipment corridors, and it fails to adequately evaluate potential groundwater impacts in California.

As noted, technical comments have been previously submitted. They are a matter of public record; they are available through your process and also at the California Energy Commission. We look forward to the opportunity to review your revised statement.

Thank you very much.

FACILITATOR HOLMES: Thank you. We have Commissioner Dick Carver, to be followed by Les Bradshaw.