

RECEIVED

12 FEB 22 2000 Our next speaker is John Scharff and then George
13 Mount and Julia Mount.

1 14 MR. SCHARFF: Yeah, I too would like to address some
15 of my transportation concerns. Number one is that using
16 the 85 mile-an-hour car running into the 20-cubic-foot
17 block wall, or whatever it was, sounds great, but that
18 wouldn't even be close to the amount of impact that you
19 would have running head-on to another, say, cement truck
20 or something coming at you from a two-lane road, say
21 along the I-20 or U.S. 27 going towards Tecopa, or
22 whatever highway is where you have head-on collisions
23 with two vehicles traveling maybe 65 miles an hour
24 apiece.

2 25 Um, I would also like to talk a little about my
0053

01 concerns about the fact that the Department of Energy
02 and their predecessors have a track record that is
03 abysmal.

04 We know that every place that they have dealt
05 with nuclear energy, they have leaks and
06 contaminations. We know Hanford now is leaking into the
07 Columbia River, and it's becoming the most nuclear
08 polluted river in the world. And yet here we have an
09 aquifer that they are willing to perch massive amounts
10 of plutonium above and seem to have no problem with:
11 Well, oops, we made another mistake.

12 They say, you know, it will be dry waste they
13 will be transporting; but they said that about the
14 wastes that they transported from Fernald that was found
15 leaking in a truck stop that came in outside of Kingman,
16 Arizona.

3 17 I think that if we look at some of the other
18 problems, like terrorism and the fact that there will be
19 40,000 protesters stopping these shipments, there will
20 be many people that will become active because of this.
21 Because we understand that this world is -- we are all
22 connected. And that if people, you know, don't consider
23 the fact of, you know, each other, that people will

24 become enraged.

4 25 Um, I see no talk about global warming and the
0054

01 effects that the scientists are talking about now, and
02 how within the next 50 years even, a hundred years, our
03 climate change may be such that that whole mountain
04 might be under water. I don't even see any
05 consideration of the amount of lawsuits and the amount
06 of time that that could possibly hold up some of the
07 shipments as has happened in the past.

5 08 I would just urge the Department of Energy to
09 withdraw this application and to consider that on the
10 baseline that they have used for no-action, that they
11 assume that there will be no new technology in a hundred
12 years; whereas, if we considered a hundred years back,
13 we wouldn't have had this problem that we have now.

14 Thank you.